

NOTE: COPIES OF THIS ANALYSIS ARE ON FILE WITH THE FBI AND LOCAL
LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EDITORIAL POLICIES

OF

THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

For the period:

Jan. 16, 1961 to Oct. 17, 1961

Prepared by:

Date: December 3, 1961

b6
b7c

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY (STAFF EDITORIALS)	6
SUMMARY (MIRROR OF PUBLIC OPINION)	15
SUMMARY (LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE)	16
SUMMARY (CONCLUSION)	17
APPENDIX I (STAFF EDITORIALS)	20
APPENDIX II (MIRROR OF PUBLIC OPINION)	50
APPENDIX III (LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE)	57
APPENDIX IV (J. EDGAR HOOVER LETTER)	87

INTRODUCTION

Based upon freedom guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, editorial staff members of newspapers have a right to express their views in writing. All other citizens have this same right. Such freedom of expression must never be destroyed.

While every individual has a right to express his or her views verbally and in writing, those views are subject to the scrutiny of others. The views of a major metropolitan newspaper such as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch are obviously subject to the scrutiny of thousands. The opinions of such a newspaper have a great impact on the community and can very nearly constitute the determining factor in forming the prevailing attitudes on political and international matters.

The Post is St. Louis' only evening newspaper and is the only reading material of many individuals therefore its policies probably have a greater proportionate impact than that of major papers in areas having more than one evening publication. This statement in no way minimizes the influence of St. Louis' morning newspaper, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, whose views are in direct opposition to those of the Post on most issues. The views of the Globe are gaining increasing acceptance in the St. Louis area as it approaches the Post in circulation.

With its evening monopoly on readers and advertisers, the Post has, for years, been in the enviable position of being able to expound its own views rather freely without too much fear of effective adverse reaction to them. These views have been expressed under the so-called "liberal" label in accordance with the papers masthead and the general acceptance of "liberal" philosophy during the past 30 years has worked in their favor. Fortunately, however, there is a new trend towards conservatism accompanied by a better understanding of Communism and Socialism which has caused many readers of the Post to question the wisdom of its policies, the trueness of its liberalism, and the loyalty of its writers.

Somehow, modern "liberals" who opposed Hitler, Tojo, and Mussolini vigorously in the past now are champions of a "soft" policy towards Communism and the Post is no exception to this phenomenon. This pseudo-liberal position tends to make the Post's policies credible to modern "intellectuals" who are overly impressed by technique and literary style, as opposed to sound principles and truth. Thus, the Post has successfully dominated and molded the thinking of thousands for many years.

Unfortunately, many individuals read their newspapers very casually and, indeed, read the editorial pages only occasionally. Because of this fact and the subtlety of the Post's writers, many readers are oblivious to what appears to the author of this analysis to be a

cleverly planned assault on their minds by cunning and devious individuals on the Post's editorial staff.

The purpose, then, is not to present a studiously objective analysis of the Post's editorial policies on all issues. It is, rather, to present an analysis which demonstrates why the author believes that individuals on the Post's staff are consciously using the paper's editorial page to serve the cause of international Communism. Accordingly, only major issues involving international affairs and Communism will be discussed.

In reading the summary and analysis of staff editorials, Mirror of Public Opinion articles, and Letters from the People, the reader should frequently refer to the following list of Communist goals which are taken from a list included in the book "The Naked Communist" by W. Cleon Skousen:

CURRENT COMMUNIST GOALS

1. Develop the illusion that total disarmament by the United States would be a demonstration of moral strength.
2. Prolong the conferences to ban atomic tests because the U.S. has agreed to suspend tests as long as negotiations are in progress.
3. U.S. acceptance of coexistence as the only alternative to atomic war.
4. Set up East and West Germany as separate states in spite of Khrushchev's promise in 1955 to settle the Germany question by free elections under supervision of the UN.
5. Grant recognition of Red China. Admission of Red China to the UN.
6. Allow all Soviet satellites individual representation in the UN.
7. Overthrow all colonial governments before native populations are ready for self-government.
8. Eliminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities.
9. Discredit and eventually dismantle the FBI.
10. Resist any attempt to outlaw the Communist Party.
11. Do away with all loyalty oaths.
12. Use technical decisions of the courts to weaken basic

American institutions by claiming their activities violate civil rights.

13. Eliminate all laws or procedures which interfere with the operation of the Communist apparatus.
14. Promote the UN as the only hope for mankind. If its charter is rewritten, demand that it be set up as a one-world government with its own independent armed forces. (Some Communist leaders believe the world can be taken over as easily by the UN as by Moscow. Sometimes these two centers compete with each other as they are now doing in the Congo.)

The above are merely the major Communist goals which the writer believes have been directly or indirectly supported by the editorial page of the Post. It is believed that the following goals also listed by Mr. Skousen have, likewise, been promoted by the Post in the past:

1. Permit free trade between all nations regardless of Communist affiliation and regardless of whether or not items could be used for war.
2. Provide American aid to all nations regardless of Communist domination.
3. Use student riots to foment public protests against programs or organizations which are under Communist attack.
4. Eliminate all laws governing obscenity by calling them "censorship" and a violation of free speech and free press.
5. Break down cultural standards of morality by promoting pornography and obscenity in books, magazines, motion pictures, radio and TV.
6. Eliminate prayer or any phase of religious expression in the schools on the ground that it violates the principle of "separation of church and state."
7. Discredit the American Constitution by calling it inadequate, old-fashioned, out of step with modern needs, a hindrance to cooperation between nations on a world-wide basis.
8. Support any socialist movement to give centralized control over any part of the culture - - education, social agencies, welfare programs, mental health clinics, etc.

9. Create the impression that violence and insurrection are legitimate aspects of the American tradition; that students and special-interest groups should rise up and use "united force" to solve economic, political or social problems.
10. Repeal the Connally Reservation so the U.S. cannot prevent the World Court from seizing jurisdiction over domestic problems. Give the World Court jurisdiction over nations and individuals alike.

To those who might question the accuracy or currency of these goals it must be pointed out that Mr. Skousen was an FBI official for 16 years and the book from which the goals were taken is the Ninth Edition, dated July 1961.

It is quite possible that the Communist "Party Line" may change and that if the Post's editorial staff has been infiltrated their particular policies might be altered temporarily because of recent public attention and adverse reaction. Accordingly, this analysis and included appendices only apply to the past period from January 16, 1961 to October 17, 1961.

While the included appendices are aimed primarily at demonstrating the agreement between the Post's editorial page and the first group of 14 Communist goals, it is the belief of the writer that there has been substantial agreement between the editorial policies of the paper during the period covered by this analysis and the second group of 10 goals. It is further believed that any objective reader will be amazed at the indicated similarities to Communist goals and will be hard pressed to describe that agreement as respectable liberalism, which is the guise under which it masquerades.

The analyses of editorials or Mirror of Public Opinion articles are those of the author but it is believed that they accurately interpret the intent of the analyzed items. Direct quotes are obviously taken out of context but it is believed that they capture the essence of the articles and reveal the true nature of those who wrote or selected them. The consistency in mood and frequency of similar comments reveal much about the staff of the Post.

Underscoring, where added for emphasis, is the work of the author of this analysis as are the notes following the items in the appendices.

All material covered in this analysis is located on the second page of the Post's editorial section. While the author usually does not agree with the conclusions included in feature articles on the first page which generally are in agreement with the items on page two, the writers are usually nationally known staff correspondents whose names are included and this justifies more respect and trust.

There is no intention anywhere in this analysis to impugn the loyalty of any of the named authors of Mirror of Public Opinion Articles or Letters from the People. There is, however, serious doubt in the mind of the author concerning the source of letters over nicknames or initials and the loyalty of those who select the printed items, write staff editorials and weave the fabric of page 2 of the editorial section into such a tapestry as it now is.

* * * * *

SUMMARY

In this section the author will summarize his observations concerning the editorial policies of the Post as evidenced by the content of staff editorials, Mirror of Public Opinion articles, and Letters from the people.

Staff editorials will be covered in greatest detail because they are written by members of the editorial staff while the other items are merely selected by staff personnel. It is believed, however, that the comments and appendices will show how the chosen items compliment the staff editorials and combine with them to influence the thinking of the reader on practically every issue in a direction favorable to the Communist cause.

A total of 210 issues of the editorial page were used in preparing this analysis. It covers 109 staff editorials and 29 Mirror of Public Opinion articles which will be analyzed with appropriate footnotes while the complete text of 31 Letters from the People will be included with general comments about that section of the editorial page.

Staff editorials analyzed in detail in Appendix I are divided into 7 categories and are arranged in date order within each category. The categories are: Disarmament-Nuclear Tests, Berlin, Red China, Laos, Cuba, The Congo, and Miscellaneous. The first 6 categories represent major issues which resulted in repetitive editorializing and therefore provide opportunity for demonstrating consistent patterns while the Miscellaneous category is a catch-all, including quite a number of issues on which a staff could serve the Communist cause well in print.

It is suggested that aside from the general conclusions presented in this summary, the reader pay special attention to the notes following some of the articles in the appendices. It is believed that not only questionable loyalty, but questionable quality as well, will be revealed. This writer believes that no paper can claim to be of high quality merely on the basis of literary style. It is believed that this attribute must be accompanied by clarity, honesty, and a sense of fair play. True quality in the field of journalism, as in every other field, is more than just cleverness with words.

I STAFF EDITORIALS

Page 2 of the Post's editorial section normally includes 6 or 7 editorials, presumably written by staff writers. These editorials, no doubt, present the true views of the staff on the issues covered, though it is quite often extremely difficult to determine what

those views are because of the subtlety of the writing.

Staff editorials, of course, cover many issues, including international, national, and local matters. In view of the number of available subjects, the author believes that the 109 editorials covered in this analysis represent a substantial number in demonstrating general agreement with the Communist line. For the dates and titles of editorials covered and detailed comments and footnotes justifying the following general comments see Appendix I.

A. Disarmament-Nuclear Tests - If this analysis demonstrates anything it most certainly shows that the Post is obsessed by the desire for disarmament. This section of Appendix I includes 28 major editorials on the subject and, as if that weren't enough, the Post writers usually drag in disarmament considerations on issues like Berlin and admission of Red China to the UN. The following are the authors observations on the Post's editorials on the subject of Disarmament-Nuclear Tests:

1. The Post constantly equates Russia and the US with respect to motives and guilt where disarmament and nuclear testing are concerned.
2. The Post consistently urged prolongation of nuclear test moratorium and minimized the significance of possible cheating by Russia.
3. The Post consistently places little emphasis on the need for and urges concessions on inspection.
4. The Post usually amplifies American intransigence and minimizes, usually by omission, the true nature of the Communists' plans for world conquest.
5. The Post consistently calls for "boldness" and "daring" on the part of America in the field of disarmament and pleads for "bold," "sweeping," and "imaginative" proposals from the U.S. for approval by Communist leaders.
6. The Post repeatedly lays the blame for failure of disarmament talks in 1955 on President Eisenhower's "Open Skies" proposal which the Post describes as a more or less unreasonable "demand."
7. The Post has maintained a steady flow of disarmament and nuclear restraint preachments unfalteringly through the Soviet created Berlin impasse, multiple Soviet violations of the nuclear test moratorium, including a 50 plus megaton explosion, establishment of a Communist base of operations in Cuba, and aggressive moves by Communists in Laos, South Vietnam, and the Congo.

8. The Post has urged disarmament and continued voluntary refusal to conduct nuclear tests while constantly insisting that the only threat to America is from without anytime anyone suggested that internal subversion is a threat.
 9. The Post has repeatedly implied that the Communists should be trusted in spite of facts (not supplied by the Post) proving they can't be trusted. (They have violated 52 of 54 agreements during the past 25 years.)
 10. It is believed that the thinking of thousands of casual readers who are uninformed about Communists (This includes a majority of the Post's readers) is slowly but surely being molded by the Post's writers with respect to disarmament and nuclear testing. Furthermore, it is believed that the Post's editorials, which hammer at the theme with almost clocklike regularity, are aimed at conditioning the innocent reader to accept or even actively promote dangerous disarmament proposals which would facilitate the spread of Communism by diminishing American capacity to resist it. No card-carrying cell member could claim greater accomplishment than this in behalf of the Communists' cause.
- B. Berlin - One consistent theme runs through the 21 analyzed editorials on the subject of Berlin. That theme is compromise. In other words, the Post insists that the U.S. accede to Russian demands for concessions in return for rights the U.S. already has. The inevitability of a divided Germany, or two Germanies, is constantly preached. The following are the author's observations on the Post's editorial policy on Berlin:
1. As is the case with disarmament, the Post consistently equates Russia and the U.S. with respect to motives and guilt in Berlin.
 2. The Post consistently generates fear of war and insists upon the urgent need for the West to rush forward with compromise proposals under duress.
 3. The Post constantly seeks to generate distrust and hatred for the Germans who are presently our most staunch ally in Europe.
 4. The Post consistently suggests permanent recognition of the Oder-Neisse line and/or recognition of East Germany in return for guaranteed access rights in Berlin. The Post, which expresses so much concern for individual liberty and self-determination for the people of Africa,

Latin America, and Asia seems relatively unconcerned about committing millions of East German residents to slavery under Communism.

5. The Post urges that the U.S. ignore or ride roughshod over Adenauer and De Gaulle to seek negotiation with the Soviets on Berlin, in spite of the reluctance of these allied leaders to negotiate with the Communists under duress.
6. The Post views the Berlin crisis as part of a power struggle between Russia and the U.S. to determine who will dominate Germany. The paper's editorials do not explain to the reader that Soviet leaders for years have adhered to Lenin's plan for world conquest which includes East Europe as an integral part. They, likewise do not keep matters in perspective by pointing out the willingness of the U.S. to reunify Germany and grant free elections. In short, the Post implies that the U.S. is as bad as the Soviet Union.
7. The Post urges that the U.S. accommodate Mr. Khrushchev and allow him to save face in Berlin or someone worse, they say, might replace him. Obviously, if this policy were followed, all Khrushchev or any other leader of the Soviet Union need do to gain a concession is to pretend to be in trouble at home.
8. The Post consistently indicates the belief that Mr. K believes in "peaceful co-existence" without defining what Communists mean by this term. (Informed students of the subject say "peaceful co-existence" on Communist terms means a temporary condition wherein constant pressure, using all available means, is applied on the West until it capitulates. True peace is considered by Communists to exist only after no-one is opposing Communism.) Do the Post's writers know this? If so, why don't they point it out to their readers? Is not the result of continuously retreating by diplomatic compromise before constant pressure inevitably complete encirclement followed by complete surrender?

Any writer who knows this and continues to describe "peaceful co-existence," promoted by Mr. Khrushchev, in a favorable light is, in the opinion of this writer, a disloyal person. Any writer who doesn't know it is not qualified to write editorials for a paper of the Post's caliber.

9. It is the opinion of the author of this analysis that the Post's editorial policies on Berlin are aimed at

bringing about the ultimate abandonment of West Berlin, recognition of East Germany, demoralization of West Germany, disintegration of NATO, and Communization of Europe. What cell member could do a better job in preparing readers for this than a clever editorial writer employed by an influential newspaper?

C. Red China - The 15 editorials on the subject of the Red Chinese government's recognition by the U.S. and its admission to the UN reveal the Post as a champion of a new policy towards this tyrannical regime. As with Disarmament, the Post hits this issue regularly and does not exhibit any objectivity by presenting the many reasons why most Americans, 76 Senators, and 395 members of the House of Representatives are opposed to admitting Red China to the UN. (Not one senator or one congressman voted against a resolution against Red China's admission. Even a liberal senator like Paul Douglas of Illinois has spoken out vigorously against the Red Regime.) The following are the author's observations concerning the Post's editorial policies toward Red China:

1. The Post consistently promotes the theory that admission of the Red Chinese to the UN is inevitable and that the United States is powerless to stop it.
2. The Post brushes aside as a "head in the sand" attitude the stand of congress against Red Chinese admission to the UN. (House voted 395 to 0 and the Senate voted 76 to 0 for a resolution against admission.) This is rather strange since the Post elsewhere extols the virtues of democracy.
3. The Post urges that the U.S. accede to the pressure of so-called neutrals who advocate Red China's admission out of fear and desire for trade and assistance in spite of the sound reasons against admission expounded by American leaders in the past. It is interesting that the Post urges the U.S. to ignore the opinion of West Germany and France in Europe but wants the nations leaders to obey the Machiavellian pressure of ambitious leaders of largely illiterate new UN countries, 20 of whom have less population than the city of West Berlin.
4. The Post does not hesitate to push for UN admission of an outlaw state like Red China while it avidly promotes the UN as a highly ethical organization which it describes as the only hope for peace. What possible logic can the Post employ to justify adding a more militant Communist nation to the UN where Russia has employed the veto about 100 times and done everything it can to make

the UN ineffective?

5. The Post consistently hints at the desirability of admitting Red China but never gives sound reasons for it and never answers the reasons of others who oppose opposition.
6. The Post consistently ridicules Chiang Kai-shek's regime on Formosa, pointing out all of Chiang's faults while discreetly avoiding a recital of the long list of crimes against humanity committed by Mao Tse-tung and his Red Regime. The Post also conveniently forgets its "liberal" humanitarianism with respect to 8,000,000 native Formosans who are protected by Chiang and the USA from Communist enslavement.

The Post does not mention the billion dollar narcotic business of Red China, its refusal to recognize the International Red Cross, its threat to India and other bordering nations and never enlightens its readers to the warlike comments of Mao Tse-tung and other Red Chinese leaders over the years. Lastly, and most strangely, this "liberal" journal which still vents its outrage over Hitler's genocide many years in the past now seems unconcerned about the Red Chinese' liquidation of from 20 to 30 million Chinese people and slave labor numbering an estimated 20 million. Can the Post's attitude towards Red China be described as liberalism?

7. The Post, having pretended that it only favored discussion of Red China's admission, immediately after discussion was placed on the agenda showed its hypocrisy by indicating in an editorial, dated October 7, 1961, that it was for admission. Of course, those who read the paper carefully with a critical eye already knew this.
8. Recognition of Red China by the U.S. and admission to the UN have been long-range Communist goals. In the writer's opinion, the Post editorial staff has served these goals well by a steady stream of clever editorials. It is also believed that the Post's handling of the Red China question shows little objectivity by ignoring the soundness of opposing views and casts serious doubt on its loyalty, its integrity, and its journalistic quality.

D. Laos - The included 7 Post editorials on Laos illustrate again how the Post, in the opinion of the author, works to prevent any effective opposition to the spread of Communism. The

following are specific observations of the author on the Post's editorial policy on Laos:

1. The Post consistently urges no military action by the U.S. in Laos even though the country has been overrun by Pathet Lao guerrillas after President Kennedy said the U.S. would not stand by and see that country taken by the Communists.
2. The Post maximizes the invincibility of Pathet Lao guerrillas.
3. The Post makes it look impossible for American fighting men to operate in Laos. The performance of U.S. troops in the Pacific against clever Japanese jungle fighters during World War II is conveniently forgotten.
4. The Post indicates that U.S. prestige is at stake in Laos then proceeds to urge policies which can only lower that prestige.
5. The Post supports the idea of coalition government in Laos, including Communists who control most of the country due to the failure of the U.S. to act quickly.
6. The author believes that the policies of the Post with respect to Laos and Southeast Asia, as do its policies on all other international matters, serve the Communist cause well.

E. Cuba - The Post, of course, joined with other so-called liberal journals in picturing Fidel Castro as the saviour of Cuba prior to his takeover. Since the takeover the Post has advocated a soft attitude towards Fidel, opposing support of the invasion and praising the subsequent "tractor deal." The Post also draws some peculiar analogies between the Cuban situation and Formosa. Here are the observations of the author:

1. The Post, while not whitewashing Fidel as much as some have done, used the Cuban invasion as the basis for an attack on the CIA and others who advocated firmness against this Communist tyrant 90 miles off U.S. shores.
2. The Post normally depicts Communist Cuba as no threat to the U.S., therefore says the U.S. should avoid any positive action to overthrow Fidel.
3. Paradoxically, the Post acknowledged the threat from an armed Communist regime 90 miles off our shores but it

did so in an editorial drawing an analogue between Cuba versus the U.S. and Formosa versus Red China. The editorial likened Cuba to Formosa and implied that Red China and the U.S. were in the same position with the same intentions. The editorial appeared immediately after the failure of the Cuban invasion.

4. The Post's policies on Cuba, it is believed, can only result in the Communists becoming more firmly entrenched in Latin America, thereby threatening the security of the Western hemisphere. Encirclement of the United States is the final stage of Communists' plans prior to the hoped for U.S. capitulation.

F. The Congo - The Congo has been a confusing area and it seems no-one really knows what is going on there. The Post, however, has editorialized on the situation and 7 of the editorials are covered in this analysis. Observations on them are as follows:

1. The Post has tended to minimize Communist activities in the Congo and has criticized the Belgians more than Communist subversives.
2. The Post has supported the concept of a Coalition government for the Congo, including Communist leaders. Coalition governments which are partially Communist have a way of becoming totally Communist rather soon after they are formed.
3. The Post supported the UN military action against Moise Tshombe to bring Katanga into the coalition. (Tshombe is the only strong anti-Communist leader in the Congo.)
4. The Post indicates that a solution of the Congo problem is more important than friendship with Belgium, which stand is, of course, true to form.
5. In the Congo the Post takes a stand which might be termed liberal but it must be pointed out that the Post's eagerness for self-determination regardless of readiness of the native population agrees with a Communist goal which makes the possibility of a Communist takeover more likely.

G. Miscellaneous - The category discussed here includes 21 editorials covering various subjects which can be directly connected with the goals and activities of Communists, both internal to America and abroad. The following are the author's beliefs concerning their content:

1. The Post consistently promotes the idea of "peaceful co-existence" in a favorable light without defining for its readers the Communist meaning of the term.
2. The Post consistently opposes any court decision against Communists or pro-Communists.
3. The Post consistently ridicules the House Committee on Un-American Activities and attempts to destroy its effectiveness.
4. The Post consistently minimizes the threat of Communist internal subversion in spite of the mountain of evidence to the contrary supplied by J. Edgar Hoover, The House Committee on Un-American Activities, The Senate Internal Security Committee, and many informed scholars of the subject.
5. The Post consistently opposes any legislation aimed at protecting the U.S. and its citizens from internal subversion and Communist propaganda.
6. The Post consistently opposes and attempts to destroy by ridicule any form of anti-Communist activity. It labels any grass-roots organization, such as the Cardinal Mindzenty Foundation and the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade as "right-wing extremists," "fanatics of the right," "radicals of the right" and equates them with The American Nazi Party, The Ku Klux Klan, and Fascists. (It has been a long-standing technique of Communists to label as "Fascist" anyone who opposes them.)

- - - - -

NOTE: The Communists in Moscow at a meeting of 81 Communist parties, including the American Communist Party, issued a manifesto on December 5, 1960 launching an aggressive anti-anti-Communist drive to destroy the grass-roots anti-Communist movement in the U.S.

An account of this anti-anti-Communist drive has been presented by Mr. Edward Hunter in sworn testimony before the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee on July 11, 1961.

The documentation presented to the sub-committee by Mr. Hunter subsequent to the testimony included, under Appendix 6 of that documentation, a feature article written by Gus Hall, General Secretary, Communist Party, USA, which appeared in the weekly Worker. The article outlined implementation of the Red Manifesto of December 5, 1960. The Worker issue was dated July 16th

though it appeared on the newstands on July 14th.

An anti-anti-Communist column by Marquis Childs, according to Mr. Hunter, appeared in the Washington Post on July 14th. The Childs column covered several of the major points included in the Gus Hall directive. Mr. Childs is a staff writer for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The testimony of Edward Hunter and the 17 Appendices documenting the participation of the newspapers in the anti-anti-Communist drive has been made a part of the Congressional Record of August 28, 1961. Copies of the record for that date can be obtained on request from Senators and Representatives. The testimony and documentation can also be obtained at a cost of 25¢ from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. (Document No. 609588 0)

- - - - -
7. The Post ridicules American military men by picturing them as stupid and bumbling. How better could a nation's morale be lowered than by destroying the respect of its populace for its military men?
 8. The Post downgrades patriotism and nationalism and endorses the UN as the saviour of mankind. It minimizes the obstructionism of the Soviet Union and fails to note how Russia has been able to stymie effective U.S. action through use of the UN mechanism.
 9. The Post consistently attempts to deceive its readers by falsely analyzing occurrences in the UN. The appointment of U. Thant of Burma as Secretary General, for example, is described as a great "Soviet Backdown" in spite of the fact that he has voted with the Soviet Union far more times than he has voted with the U.S. He also favors admission of Red China to the UN.
 10. It is the opinion of the author that the Post invariably takes a stand on nearly every issue connected with Communism at home or abroad which agrees with the position of the Communists themselves.

* * * * *

II MIRROR OF PUBLIC OPINION ARTICLES

It is not necessary to discuss Mirror of Public Opinion articles at great length. It is obvious, however, that they have been carefully selected by the Post's staff to effectively compliment the paper's staff editorials. It is equally obvious that they are generally taken from "left-wing" publications and usually emphasize

the so-called "liberal" view on most issues. Of course the word "liberal" is used here with tongue in cheek for the author believes that the Post's policies represent something quite different from liberalism.

Since many subjects are covered by the articles it is believed that the 29 analyzed in Appendix II present a fair picture of the general tone of those covering foreign policy or Communism in general. It is also believed that the handling of some of the articles reveals a definite lack of journalistic integrity on the part of the Post's staff.

It is suggested that the reader compare the analysis of articles in this section to the staff editorials analyzed in Appendix I and the Communist goals listed in the introduction.

* * * * *

III LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE

This section of the Post, while allegedly consisting of contributions from readers, provides a good yardstick for evaluating the nature of the men who run the editorial section of the paper.

About 19.1% of all letters printed in the 210 issues of the Post covered by this analysis included only the initials of the writer or some nickname, either selected by the Post editors or the writers of the letters. Sample nicknames are as follows: Gadfly, Pax, Veritas, Dupavillon, Perplexed, Egghead, and Plato.

Approximately 9% of the letters printed were from areas out of the normal readership community, in which the author includes outstate Missouri and Illinois. Almost without exception, those letters from distant areas, usually given the number one spot, have leaned considerably to the left, placing them in substantial agreement with the Post's own editorial policies. Street addresses of local contributors are notorious by their absence.

Those who consistently defend the Post on the grounds of "quality" must rule out integrity and intellectual courage as criteria which determine journalistic quality. Surely, any paper which omits the name of the writer from 1 out of 5 of its letters and favors writers from "out-of-town" over local contributors to editorialize more effectively in its "Letters" column raises serious doubts about its integrity and sense of fair play.

Many more conservative letter writers have ceased contributing to the Post because of the refusal of the paper to print effective rebuttals to its left-wing policies.

The Post's competitor, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, always includes the name of its letter writers and, to the best of the author's

knowledge, always includes the complete address of local contributors. This practice should count for much when relative quality of the two editorial sections is discussed.

It is the author's opinion that the Post's Letters from the People column, as do its editorials and Mirror of Public Opinion articles, reveals a certain deviousness of character and meanness of mind, as well as a distinct un-American bias.

By proper selection and placement, a newspaper can make of its "Letters" column a very effective equivalent of a daily feature editorial. The author believes that the Post has managed to do this effectively and has thus made this section serve well some of the Communist causes listed in the introduction. See Appendix III.

* * * * *

IV CONCLUSION

As indicated in the introduction, the constitutional right of newspapers, as well as individuals, to express themselves is clear. There is no official arm of the United States Government which has the authority or legal right to prevent the legitimate expression of opinions.

This freedom has placed newspapers in an almost omnipotent position and has given them tremendous power over the minds of American readers. Many, who challenge every verbal expression, even those of trusted friends, tend to accept and quote as gospel the written words appearing in print and seem almost to forget that they were produced by fallible mortals.

With every right there is, if not a legal one, a moral responsibility to exercise that right in the best interest of other people and the country whose constitution protects it. Freedom from legal restraint can only exist in direct proportion to the willingness of a people to use moral restraint and good judgement in their conduct.

Under a free system there is little to restrain a newspaper from any extreme in the realm of ideas except the conscience of its staff and their dependence upon the acceptance of their ideas by others. A newspaper is, after all, a business enterprise which is beholden to its customers, the advertisers and readers, for financial support. The hearts and minds of these customers constitute a restraint which must be employed to avoid the governmental control found in totalitarian societies.

Communists who are dedicated to the task of subverting and demoralizing America are well aware of the freedoms enjoyed by her mass-media and know full well how to take advantage of that freedom.

Accordingly, they have included, as one of their major goals, the infiltration of the press. That the so-called "liberal" members of the press would be the easiest to penetrate is obvious for who can deny the similarity between Communism which is merely Marxist-Socialism and modern liberalism which is merely Fabian-Socialism masquerading under a more acceptable label. How simple it is for them to sell Socialism-Communism under the "liberal" label to pre-occupied and apathetic Americans who have forgotten what true liberalism really is!

The outcome of the struggle between Communism-Socialism and freedom will be determined by the thinking of Americans and the direction of that thinking will be determined primarily by the mass-media. What if powerful members of the mass-media are being skillfully used by individuals to help bring about the Communization or Socialization of the world by directing American thinking into the desired channels?

What must an individual do if he sincerely believes the policies of a major newspaper are working to the detriment of his country? Has he not the right, more than that the duty, to oppose those policies with every legal means at his disposal? Does he not have the right and duty to point out the similarity between a newspaper's policies and known Communist goals? Doesn't he also have the right to spotlight lack of journalistic integrity for others who may have casually read and trusted a newspaper for many years?

President Kennedy has said that Americans should not ask what their country can do for them but should ask what they can do for the country. Americans can best serve their country by resisting any individual or organization expressing views they believe to be contrary to that country's best interests.

Perilous times are ahead for America. Communists are applying pressure throughout the world and are attempting to subvert internally the free nations of the world. The United States is calling into service many of its reserves and is spending about \$50,000,000,000 per year to protect itself from external attack and defend freedom abroad while the Attorney General's office is about to take action against regular Communist party members. What can be done about fellow travellers, sympathizers, and dupes who may be manipulating the editorial pages of major newspapers? Are they to be left free to operate unopposed just because they don't wear a sign saying "Communist" for the convenience of the Attorney General's office?

The author believes it is the duty of St. Louis advertisers and subscribers to use their influence to insure that both newspapers in the area represent something of which St. Louisans can be proud. How can an advertiser or subscriber who says he thinks a newspaper is "pink" toss off that statement lightly and continue to advertise

in or subscribe to that newspaper and still consider himself to be patriotic? Furthermore, how can such a man expect young men, perhaps his own sons, to fight and die opposing Communists, as many have done in the past, if he himself will not lift a finger to oppose Communists in the realm of ideas?

The young people of this nation deserve to have passed into their hands something better than a life under totalitarian regimentation which came about because of the apathy and materialistic preoccupation of their parents.

Now, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in the opinion of the author, has the potential to become a truly great newspaper. It employs many loyal St. Louisans and no-one should wish to see it destroyed. Advertisers and subscribers who express themselves forcefully regarding its policies need not do so in the spirit of destroying the organization but should do so in the interest of forcing its management and ownership to ferret out and remove those who, it seems to the author, are using it to serve the cause of Communism.

To survive economically in a competitive system the producer of a product, even a journalistic product, has the freedom and the need to improve that product if enough of its potential customers do not accept it in its present form.

The author of this analysis does not expect or hope that anyone will automatically believe as he does as a result of reading this analysis. He only hopes that those who read it will investigate for themselves, discuss the matter with others, become better informed, and not allow their opinions to be formed by one newspaper. Indeed, all St. Louisans should carefully evaluate both St. Louis newspapers and make their own decisions. The better informed readers are the less apt they are to be mislead. The less apt Americans are to be mislead the less apt Communism is to survive in competition with freedom.

* * * * *

"Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival.

"There may be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves."

- Winston Churchill

* * * * *

SEE APPENDIX IV

APPENDIX I

ANALYSIS OF STAFF EDITORIALS

A. DISARMAMENT - NUCLEAR TESTS

Jan. 16, 1961 - A New Moment of Hope

Says Eisenhower's unreasonable "open skies" proposal destroyed disarmament chances when Russia was ready to accept "a large measure" of the US disarmament plan in 1955.

Jan. 22, 1961 - In Mortal Hands

Indicates that President Kennedy's major effort should be directed towards disarmament. Downgrades need for inspection.

Jan. 25, 1961 - It Means Disarm

Praises President for calling meeting on disarmament. Criticizes West's past requirement of Arms Control before disarmament and urges "bold and sweeping measures" in the field of disarmament.

Jan. 31, 1961 - Courage Candor and Idealism

States that "Nothing is more important than the determination to frame a coherent and positive disarmament policy."

Feb. 5, 1961 - A Central Goal

Insists that total, not partial, disarmament should be the U.S. goal. Further states that Russians really are interested in disarmament and that we should trust them. The editorial says "nothing will be lost by assuming their good faith until or unless the assumption is proved false."

Note: The editorial doesn't mention that the Communists have broken 52 of 54 agreements during the past 25 years and that unarmed Russia could not control her satellites.

Mar. 16, 1961 - Sendoff for Geneva

Expresses confidence in Russia's intentions to live up to any negotiated test ban treaty and urges that such a treaty be negotiated subject to international inspection and control.

Apr. 5, 1961 - Open Door for Arms Talks

Says Kennedy administration should pursue arms talks with a

sense of urgency and points out that the administration "should stop wondering about whether the Russians mean business and start acting and thinking as if the United States did."

May 4, 1961 - Keep Talking at Geneva

Urges continuation of Geneva nuclear test ban talks and says "it would be unreasonable to insist that the conflict be ended before disarmament can begin." The editorial does not mention the possibility that Russians have been secretly conducting nuclear tests but says "an arms treaty is worth striving for even though we know that in spite of it the Communists would go on trying to extend their influence by riding the currents of change in the world." It makes no mention of the fact that Communists use arms consistently in riding and stimulating those currents of change.

May 23, 1961 - NATO Rockets Can Wait

Urges that nuclear weapons be withheld from NATO and pushes for disarmament in general.

Jun. 6, 1961 - After Vienna a Decision

Urges the President to go ahead with arms talks and to speed up the development of new ideas for presentation to the Communists. Indicates some doubt about Khrushchev's intention to create a new Berlin crisis.

Jun. 14, 1961 - The Test Bar Talks

Urges that the Administration continue seeking agreement to bar nuclear tests because pushing for such an agreement will be a propaganda advantage.

Jun. 18, 1961 - Dilemma on Testing

Urges that the US continue to refrain from testing in spite of the Soviet's unwillingness to negotiate a test bar agreement and points out that we have a propaganda advantage by not testing.

Jun. 30, 1961 - Debate on Testing

Describes the debate in America with regard to resumption of nuclear tests and agrees with Arthur Dean that "the United States should remain at the conference table as long as possible."

Jul. 6, 1961 - The Decision on Nuclear Testing

Gives all the reasons why nuclear testing should not be

resumed then says it's up to the President.

Jul. 14, 1961 - Despite a Dim Outlook

Despite the Berlin crisis urges that every effort be made to arrange a disarmament conference during talks beginning in Moscow. It also urges President Kennedy to "lay before the world a new and comprehensive arms plan." The editorial closes with: "The West should demonstrate beyond doubt or cavil that it is genuinely ready to go the last mile in halting the arms race and bringing mankind back to its senses."

Note: The Post must believe that "mankind," not the Soviet Union, has created the world crisis.

Jul. 21, 1961 - Report to the UN

Praises the decision of the US and Britain to take nuclear test ban talks to the Un General Assembly and expresses pleasure that this implies a further delay in decision of US whether or not to resume testing.

Jul. 30, 1961 - Where Scientists Differ

Points out the differences among scientists concerning adequacy of inspection methods for monitoring nuclear testing and favors the side which says controls are "reasonably adequate." Urges continuation of the moratorium on testing.

Aug. 11, 1961 - What After Geneva

Urges continued negotiation on disarmament and points out that Mr. Mc Cloy has not been talking disarmament but is "Talking how to talk disarmament." The editorial raises a question about the sincerity of his talk by asking "Is it possible that he pursues these tactics because, among other reasons, he has nothing really to talk about in the sense of a fresh, constructive, imaginative plan as a basis for negotiations?"

Aug. 16, 1961 - No Tolerable Alternative

Urges support for Senator Hubert Humphrey's new bill proposing a huge disarmament agency and says disarmament should be the major goal of the Kennedy Administration. The editorial also says the risk is greater now than it would be to disarm.

Aug. 27, 1961 - A Place to Start

Insists upon the need for the West to come forward with a specific disarmament plan, suggesting that it would be possible to begin by again proposing a 5 year old plan of which it

claims Russia accepted "all the essentials of it." The editorial again blames Eisenhowers "demand" for "open skies" for failure to reach agreement and urges the Kennedy administration to break the deadlock by reproposing the plan or some modification thereof.

Aug. 30, 1961 - Next to the UN

Urges the administration not to resume testing until it has laid a disarmament plan before the UN. It also applauds further willingness to compromise on inspection. It says that President Kennedy "will be in a much stronger moral position if he has previously made the strongest possible case for immediate disarmament in the court of world opinion."

Sept. 1, 1961 - Take It to the UN

This editorial is in response to the Soviet Union's resumption of nuclear tests. It urges that the US should delay resumption of tests until "the most propitious date."

This editorial deserves special attention. Two of its key paragraphs follow:

"President Kennedy ought to use the interim period, we think, to bring an indictment of the Soviet Union before the United Nations. It would not be amiss if he went personally to the General Assembly opening Sept. 19 and laid his case before the bar of world opinion.

"He should recount the long and patient efforts our negotiators have made to arrive at a test ban agreement. He should cite the series of concessions made in the vain hope of reaching a meeting of minds with Moscow. He should renew, in the most specific terms, the nations readiness to sign a properly safeguarded test-ban treaty at once, and to proceed to general disarmament. He should make clear that only one barrier stands in the way, and that is the Soviet Union's blind and cynical refusal to participate in the shaping of a structure of international law to take the place of nationalist anarchy."

Note: An examination of the text of President Kennedy's speech included in the Sept. 25, 1961 issue will show that he did essentially everything the Post urged in the above described editorial. The "shoulds," "ought tos," and "would not be amisses" were obeyed almost to the letter. See the comments on the editorial of Sept. 26, 1961 entitled "Appeal to Reason."

Sept. 3, 1961 - A Hand to Underplay

Urges that the US not push too far its propaganda advantage gained by Russia's resumption of testing. It emphasizes the

need to court world opinion by appearing before the UN as "an honest advocate of test cessation and disarmament." The editorial says of the challenge "President Kennedy ought to meet it, we think, by presenting to the United Nations a complete draft treaty for an immediate beginning on disarmament, with the inspection-control system spelled out clearly."

Sept. 6, 1961 - Links in a Chain

Praises US for confining resumed nuclear tests to underground tests. It further says there is nothing wrong with being prepared for atmospheric tests but it says "What is prudent for the West, however can hardly be identified as moral perfidy when carried on by the Soviets." It goes on, of course, to point out the West's obligation to work for general disarmament.

Note: On the surface the Post's logic often seems sound. But what is the truth of the nuclear test-disarmament situation? Is not the only real cause of armament and nuclear testing the aggressive drive of the Communist powers toward world domination? Why does the Post minimize this and constantly justify Russia's need for arms on the same basis as the needs of the US? If Russia, China, and Cuba were merely Socialistic states which bothered no-one else the Post's arguments would hold. Since this is not true the arguments do not hold. In the face of the facts, it is the view of the author that no informed writer could present arguments like those of the Post unless he was a Communist or pro-Communist.

Sept. 14, 1961 - If He Moves Boldly

Once again urges that President Kennedy propose at the UN a bold and sincere disarmament plan. The editorial again points out that the Soviets had accepted the "principles of the Western disarmament plan" in 1955 "when President Eisenhower in effect raised the ante by demanding open skies as a precedent to disarmament." It mentions disappointment at the failure of the neutrals to denounce Soviet resumption of testing but says....."Is it not equally possible that the real reason was a distressing suspicion that East and West are equally to blame for the arms race?"

Note: The Post seems obsessed with the 1955 proposal and seems dedicated to proving the US is at fault for failure to reach a disarmament agreement. In the face of increased Communist pressure, it is also obvious that the Post only wishes President Kennedy to be "bold" and "daring" in the area of disarmament.

Sept. 22, 1961 - One Step Forward

Urges complete disarmament agreements between East and West

and implies that both powers (Russia and USA) are guilty of wanting propaganda, rather than a treaty.

Sept. 26, 1961 - Appeal to Reason

This editorial comments on President Kennedy's address to the UN. It praises the President's speech as an "eloquent appeal to reason" and expresses pleasure at his "daring offer to submit our national sovereignty to the law of a world community" as well as his pledge of peaceful negotiation on Berlin. The Post seems particularly happy about the willingness of the President to subjugate our national will to that of the UN membership saying:

"He was saying in effect that the United States is willing to build up the Assembly as the central and dominant organ of the United Nations - which means submitting our own national policies to international law even though we may not be able to dominate or veto the decisions of the international body."

The editorial goes on to praise President Kennedy's inspirational skill in accepting the Soviet goal of general and complete disarmament but reconciling it with the need for balanced progress by "stages" by stressing the need for international inspection within the framework of the UN. It points out that by doing this as well as making a test-ban treaty part of the general disarmament talks he "notably strengthened the sincerity of the Western position."

Note: This editorial eulogizes President Kennedy who had just gone before the UN and said everything the Post had been saying he should, ought to, or he would do well to say. It is very strange that the Post did not do the very human thing of pointing out that he did what the Post suggested. It was almost as if Ted Sorensen and company took the speech from the Post editorial pages yet the Post seems almost to divert attention from this fact. Why?.....President Kennedy, it is claimed reads the Post. Is this where he and his "advisers" get their "ideas?" (It must be pointed out that recently the Post acknowledged the similarity of some of the Presidents remarks about the omnipotence and omniscience of the US during his blast at the so-called right-wing extremists and those in a recent Post editorial. It also must be pointed out, however, that the Post is well aware of the activities of the writer who has been opposing its views vigorously both verbally and in writing for some time now. The writer has spoken freely on the phone and publicly of the implications of the apparent ideological connection between the Post and the White House. Can it be that the Post has got wind of this and is now trying to mend flaws in its fences by appearing to be more open and above board?) The author believes that there are enough left-wing extremists around President Kennedy to justify a serious

investigation of the implied connection.

Sept. 29, 1961 - Pressing the Initiative

Urges President Kennedy to follow up the initiative he gained by his UN speech on the subject of disarmament. It urges serious consideration of some Russian counter-proposals and suggests that the first stage in reduction of armed forces should be substantial. The editorial indicates that the US should not make an arms treaty contingent upon large scale revision of the UN charter, saying..."International law and collective security must indeed be strengthened as national armaments are reduced, but it is all too clear that if American policy is to delay disarmament until a world government is set up, an arms treaty will be unattainable in the foreseeable future. Yet progress toward curbing the arms race is essential now."

Note: The Soviet Union was busily conducting atmospheric tests in violation of the moratorium as the editorial was being written.

COMMUNISM HAS ENGULFED OVER ONE-THIRD OF THE EARTH'S POPULATION and IS NOW DOING EVERYTHING IN ITS POWER TO CARRY OUT ITS LONG-RANGE PLANS TO ENSLAVE THE REMAINING TWO-THIRDS. COMMUNIST LEADERS HAVE VIOLATED PRACTICALLY EVERY AGREEMENT EVER MADE WITH THE USA DURING THE PAST 25 YEARS.

TO PERSIST IN URGING THE US TO ENTER INTO AN ARMS AGREEMENT; TO BELIEVE THAT THE COMMUNISTS WILL HONOR SUCH AN AGREEMENT IF THEY ENTER INTO IT; AND TO ADVOCATE IN THE FACE OF EVERY AGGRESSIVE MOVE OF THE COMMUNISTS A NEW DISARMAMENT PROPOSAL BORDERS ON BEING PATHOLOGICAL IN THE AUTHOR'S OPINION. IF IT IS NOT PATHOLOGICAL WHAT IS IT?

* * * * *

B. BERLIN

May 11, 1961 - Berlin as Before

Talks of general expectation that Khrushchev will provoke a new Berlin crisis and suggests that we should offer to negotiate. The editorial also indicates that the US wants an armed Germany as part of NATO.

Jun. 4, 1961 - Paris and Vienna

Plays down the strength of NATO and urges willingness on the part of the US to negotiate a reasonable settlement on Berlin and Germany.

Jun. 12, 1961 - Another Blast at Berlin

Suggests accomodation of Communists in return for continued access to Berlin, saying "So there is the possibility that an agreement on the status of Berlin and access to the city may be gained some day in exchange for an accomodation on Communist East Germany."

Jun. 25, 1961 - Key to National Survival

This is a massive editorial covering so many facets of our relations with the Communists that it defies categorization. It is placed under Berlin only because that is the first major crisis mentioned in the editorial.

The editorial points out the shift in power away from the US, warns of the power of Russia and China, urges change in foreign policy and some decisions "which will be hurtful to national pride," says it is the duty of the Kennedy Administration to prepare Americans for these decisions, accuses those who oppose the changes suggested by the Post of doing so out of misguided conservatism, quotes Walter Lippman and others to prove that the recommended compromises are not appeasement, takes a swipe at the John Birch society and the "overly zealous anti-Communist organizations," and repeats the Post's oft-stated desire for a new policy towards Red China.

Paradoxically, after preaching the inevitability and invincibility of Communism and advocating compromise with it at every turn in this and practically every other editorial on the subject, the Post closes this masterpiece of confusion with the following paragraph:

"The United States is the strongest, wealthiest, freest, most stable nation on earth. It has every asset of brains and idealism needed for greatness except a sense of national purpose for the long pull. That must grow from the conviction of the people, and the administration must lead in supplying it."

Note: Patriotic readers should be concerned lest the "long pull" be shortened in favor of the Communists by the implementation of policies advocated by the Post. Much of the "brains and idealism" which have made the US the strongest most stable nation in the world resides within the hearts and minds of patriotic conservatives who are so detested by the Post.

Jul. 9, 1961 - Pressures on Khrushchev

Says Khrushchev may be under pressures from the more militantly Marxist Red China therefore the US should go easy on him so he can save face in Berlin.

Note: It is interesting that the Post does not hesitate to emphasize the more warlike nature of Red China when urging a soft policy towards Russia but tends to ignore or minimize it when discussion of Red China's qualification for UN admission is involved.

Jul. 12, 1961 - Flexibility in Berlin

Urges flexibility on the part of Mayor Willy Brandt of Berlin to make it "easier for the West to propose a new status for Berlin, perhaps along the lines suggested by Senator Mansfield and others." (Suggested status was that of an international city.)

Jul. 19, 1961 - Ingredients for Negotiation

This is a massive editorial again urging negotiation on Berlin and, as usual, equates the US and Russia without mentioning differences in intentions. It closes by saying "The West should test his words by preparing to negotiate and honorable status for Berlin."

Note: One wonders what the undefined "honorable status" can possibly be.

Jul. 23, 1961 - The Laughing Ghost

Describes the irony of the US and Russia, allies in defeating Germany, struggling for control of Germany 16 years later. As usual the Post equates the aims of the US and Russia and says their ideological division has resulted in "a naked struggle of national power" involving a "fierce contest for control of Germany."

Note: The Post never seems to acknowledge that Khrushchev and Russian leaders before him, have vowed to conquer the world and have thus far used every form of coercion and subversion to do so while the US has only tried to protect the freedom of Europe and the remaining free world.

Jul. 26, 1961 - Firmness with Moderation

Praises President Kennedy's speech on Berlin but urges that an effort be made to "negotiate an interim status for Berlin which will protect our rights and the city's freedom while meeting any legitimate Soviet objections to the status quo."

Note: The Post does not suggest what "legitimate" objections the Soviets could have but seems to imply that there are some.

Jul. 28, 1961 - Alternatives on Germany

Presents several alternatives in Germany but implies the inevitability of a divided Germany and warns against arming West Germany.

Aug. 8, 1961 - The Duty to Discuss

Urges negotiation on Berlin saying the West "must also prepare to discuss in good faith the whole problem of a German peace settlement."

Aug. 15, 1961 - Dangers to be Contained

Points out the dangers in Berlin as a result of the Communist built wall and seems to minimize Khrushchev's role by saying "Even at the cost of a propaganda setback, Khrushchev had to agree to let Ulbricht clamp down." The editorial goes on to point out all the weaknesses in the West's position and urges negotiation, saying that if the Soviets do not interfere with our rights "the West has a stronger duty than ever to prepare for sincere and meaningful negotiations for a settlement which, while effectively guaranteeing the freedom of West Berlin, will reduce its potential as a tinderbox danger to peace."

Aug. 17, 1961 - Wisely Thinking Twice

Warns against any action in Berlin in reprisal for the building of the wall, urging the West not to claim rights it does not have.

Aug. 20, 1961 - Conflict Unresolved

Criticizes Dean Rusk for using strong words on Berlin wall then backing down because the West would have slim chances to reopen the border. It goes on to complain that the new administration "has not resolved the basic conflict in our policy on Berlin and Eastern Europe - has not, in fact moved beyond the Dulles position." The editorial makes very clear that we shouldn't even talk tough and should be prepared to negotiate compromises to reduce "tensions."

Aug. 29, 1961 - Not Only Demands

Speaks of Secretary Rusk's preparing to meet with Gromyko on Berlin in September and says "This is good news indeed, but it remains to be seen whether either the Soviets or the West is prepared to make the kind of mutual concessions that are necessary for a lasting settlement."

The editorial urges concessions by the West by saying "And what of the West? Are its leaders preparing to make concessions

as well as demands?" It goes on to point out that a contradiction in our policy is that we "refuse to contemplate recognition of a divided Germany, while at the same time we insist on an armed Germany taking its place as the most powerful European member of the Western alliance."

Note: This editorial is a perfect example of the oft-repeated technique of the Post. It follows the typical line of equating the intentions of both East and West and suggests that our conduct is as bad as Russia's on the Berlin issue. As usual, no mention is made of the United States reasons for wanting an armed Germany in the center of NATO. i.e. the avowed aims of Communist leaders to gain control of Europe as part of their plan for world-conquest. If Communists tore down the wall, allowed free elections as we allow them in West Germany, and showed signs of renouncing plans for world-conquest perhaps the US would be less concerned about the need for an armed Germany.

Sept. 10, 1961 - Understanding Mr. K

Urges that the US negotiate sincerely with Mr. Khrushchev on Berlin and points out that it might be in the interest of the West to conduct itself in such a way that Khrushchev's position in the Kremlin hierarchy will be strengthened because someone worse might replace him. The editorial says "We can drop the pretense that there isn't any Berlin problem except of Khrushchev's invention."

In praising Mr. Khrushchev, the editorial says:

"But let us not forget that it was he who in 1955 accepted the Western disarmament plan which the Russians had been rejecting for three years; he who signed an Austrian peace treaty after years of Soviet intransigence on this issue; he who greatly expanded Soviet cultural contacts with the West; he who toured the United States in the interest of international friendship; and he who has fought a great internal struggle in the Communist party for the idea of peaceful co-existence instead of implacable war."

Note: Informed persons believe that Mr. K's trip to the US was a personal triumph which impressed Russians and increased his stature at home and they see this as the real reason for the trip. Does the Post really believe that Khrushchev believes in peaceful co-existence on US terms? How can the Post speak in favorable terms of a man like Khrushchev who brought about the forced starvation of an estimated 5 to 12 million Kulaks in the Ukraine and issued the order to slaughter thousands of Hungarians? Is the Post so uninformed about Mr. Khrushchev as its editorials seem to indicate? Does the

Post suggest that the West accomodate each succeeding Russian leader because the next one could be worse?

Sept. 13, 1961 - East Berlin Preview

Points out all the difficulties the West could encounter if Russia signs a treaty with East Germany and the latter interferes with access to Berlin. The editorial goes on to urge negotiation with Russia, saying such negotiations "might bring us enforceable guarantees from both the East Germans and Russians in exchange for de facto recognition of the division of Germany."

Sept. 15, 1961 - The Place to Begin

Flatly urges compromise in Berlin. The following quotes are taken from the editorial:

"Yet each side must know that there is no point in holding negotiations unless both are willing at some point to withdraw from their starting positions in the interest of a compromise agreement that serves the interests of both."

"Thus the vital question is whether Khrushchev on his side and President Kennedy on our side, while publicly endeavoring to appear uncompromising are privately ready to make reciprocal concessions at the proper time. We hope they both are; and we also hope President Kennedy, in that event, has some plan in mind for educating the country on the need for and honorability of compromise."

"Negotiations are essential and it is equally so that they be approached in a genuine spirit of conciliation and compromise."

Note: Underscoring has been added by the author. Since the Soviet Union in Berlin, as everywhere else, is aggressively taking the initiative what can negotiation result in but an advantage for them? Russia makes the demands and the Post says compromise is honorable. Why does the Post glorify compromise and obscure the one-sidedness any compromise must have? All readers must ponder the cynical view that the President of the United States is talking one way and planning to convince the people differently in order to accommodate the Communists. The writer who wrote this editorial must believe in a different form of government than a Representative Republic.

Sept. 20, 1961 - Much to Negotiate

Points out that there is much to negotiate in Berlin and says

the ADA favors de facto recognition of East Germany in exchange for "more reliable" guarantees of Western access to and rights in Berlin. It also suggests broader terms to discuss problems of European security and some ~~form of~~ nuclear disarmament. The editorial says we should negotiate and that this negotiation should be carried out "whether DeGaulle and Adenauer like it or not."

Note: Apparently the only members of the world community whose favors the Post want for the US are the more primitive militarily weak neutrals. Major allies who are strong industrially and militarily must be ignored and humiliated.

Oct. 3, 1961 - Convincing the West

Points out that President Kennedy's most difficult task may be that of convincing West German and French governments, as well as a sizeable part of the American people, that negotiations on Berlin ought to be held and a compromise settlement accepted. It defends a compromise involving "partial" recognition of East Germany by saying "Pending that day, it is no disgrace to admit to ourselves, the West Germans and the French that two Germanies do exist, one in each military alliance, and that peaceful intercourse between them is necessary."

Oct. 17, 1961 - Time to Tell DeGaulle

Criticizes DeGaulle for preventing immediate negotiations on Berlin and warns of the need for haste to avoid war. It points out all the reasons why Khrushchev wants a settlement of the Berlin issue and strangely says "Communist or otherwise, any government in Moscow would undoubtedly follow the same course."

The editorial goes on to point out that the US should bring De Gaulle into line saying "As the principal country which would have to fight a war, the United States has the right and duty to say what shall be done to avert war."

Note: The Post seems to wish to dignify Russian claims in Berlin by implying her policies are prudent and any government would behave the same. The Post almost seems to consider Russia's position as one of having to protect herself from American aggression. It is also interesting to note that while the Post wishes the US to accede to the wishes of weak neutrals and Communists on issues such as Red China's admission to the UN, it urges the US to ride roughshod over France simply because De Gaulle is wisely cautious about negotiation with the Soviet Union under duress.

* * * * *

C. RED CHINA

Jan. 20, 1961 - Red China's Stand

Indicates probability and implies desirability of Red China's admission to the UN. It says "But let those who would dwell on the difficulties of the task contemplate a nation of 650,000,000 people armed with nuclear weapons and outlawed by the UN. That should be enough to encourage every effort."

Note: The Post should contemplate the fact that a goodly number of the 45,000 American soldiers killed in Korea were killed by Red Chinese who were then and are now at war with the UN. The Post should likewise ask its readers to contemplate the obstruction of the Russians in the United Nations and visualize what it would be like to have Red China, by the Post's own admission a more militant power, helping them. Surely, Americans have not^{so} turned their backs on national integrity and respect for the men who died in Korea that they will swallow the selling job of papers like the Post in behalf of Red China.

Mar 7, 1961 - Mr. Berle in Brazil

Says that Brazil's position on the Red China question constitutes a warning that the US must reconsider its position with regard to Red China.

Apr. 17, 1961 - Shifting Tactics in the UN

Points out that US opposition to debate on Red China's admission to the UN cannot prevail much longer and advocates debate. Criticizes Republican congressmen for trying to push through congress a declaration of opposition to admission (not discussion of admission) of Red China.

Note: Since no Senator or Representative voted against the subsequent declaration against admission, it must be assumed that Democrats also oppose admission of Red China to the UN.

May 6, 1961 - The New Neo-isolationism

Points out the trend towards favoring discussion of seating of Red China in UN among Asian and African nations and urges that the US not risk a "humiliating defeat" by continuing to oppose discussion.

Note: Contrast this willingness to capitulate to opinions of illiterate African nations with the Post's suggestions about our allies, France and West Germany, who advocate a firm

policy towards the Communists.

May 16, 1961 - Red China and the UN

Advocates debate on Red China's admission to the UN and points out that this is not the same as advocating admission.

May 29, 1961 - Mr. Diefenbaker on China

Urges discussion of Red China's admission to the UN.

Jun. 7, 1961 - Chinese Pressure in Laos

Suggests that the Red Chinese are putting pressure on Russians in the Laotian dispute and quotes from a book by Marvin L. Kalb who thinks "the Chinese have done everything possible to sabotage Khrushchev's efforts to improve Soviet-American relations." The editorial of course advocates a review of our policy towards China, implying a more friendly one.

Jul. 2, 1961 - Ev and Charlie Appalled

Advocates a change in policy towards Red China and accuses Senator Everett Dirksen and Representative Charles Halleck who were pushing for resolutions in Congress against Red China's admission to the UN of doing so for political reasons.

Jul. 7, 1961 - Shifting Asian Policy

Discusses need for change in policy towards Red China and the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Formosa and, as usual, is opposed to Chiang. The editorial closes with: "United States policy makers should be encouraged to act only in the best interests of the United States, regardless of whether Chiang (and his diminishing clique in Washington) likes it or not."

Note: The Post has never demonstrated just how admission of Red China to the UN, where its ally, Russia, has exercised the veto about 100 times, would serve the best interest of either the US or the UN.

It is appropriate here to point out some similarity in terms. Walter Lippmann's column in the December 6, 1961 issue of the Post (read while this analysis was being prepared) quotes Mr. Zorin, Russian delegate to the UN, as saying that if the UN ousted the Nationalist government and seated the Red Chinese government the latter would have "the right to liquidate the clique of Chiang Kai-shek both by peaceful means and through the use of force." Zorin says "clique"The Post says "clique." CLIQUE SEMEEQUE CLIQUE SEMAQUE -----It all sounds the same to the author of this analysis.

Jul. 30, 1961 - A Crumbling Position

Criticises the Senate's 76 to 0 vote on a resolution against recognition of Red China and its admission to the UN and urges that the US change its position on discussion of Red China's admission rather than risk a humiliating defeat in the UN.

Note: The Post seems able to brush aside very lightly the unanimous opinion of the Senate and urge formulation of US foreign policy to please Asian and African neutrals in spite of the papers constant assertion that it believes in democracy.

Aug. 3, 1961 - Chiang and the Facts

Emphasizes the inevitability of discussion of Red China's admission to the UN and complains that President Kennedy's freedom of movement on the China question is hampered by the Senate's resolution in opposition to Red China.

Aug. 14, 1961 - Prospects on China

Points out trend in opinion of UN delegates to the General Assembly towards seating of Red China. The last two paragraphs of the editorial follow:

"The delegates, of course, carry out but do not make the policies of their governments. In the showdown the United States government's facilities for twisting governmental arms may produce enough votes to continue the present stalemate for another session or two. But all the evidence suggests that though American opinion on the China question may be frozen, opinion everywhere else is moving steadily in favor of admitting Peiping."

"It would be a curious twist of history if the United States, by failing to press for "two Chinas" when such a solution was possible should be ultimately confronted by one China represented by the Communists."

Note: Again inevitability of Red China's admission is preached. Again none of the US reasons for opposing admission are given. Adherence to principle is described as having "frozen opinion." Perhaps the Post prefers the Communist technique of threats with rockets and bombs to U.S. diplomatic techniques which the Post so easily describes as "twisting of governmental arms."

Sept. 5, 1961 - Shift on China

Ridicules the House of Representatives resolution passed by a 395 to 0 vote, to oppose admission of Communist China to the UN. It goes on to say that the Kennedy administration should be "left free to devise a new China program." It preaches

the inevitability of Red China's admission by saying "If the United States does not do this soon it will be forced to do it later."

Sept. 22, 1961 - Toward Debate on China

Praises decision of US to back a proposal to debate admission of Communist China to the UN. It also says that Red China's admission is an "arguable" question but points out that the status quo cannot be maintained. It closes with the statement - "Nothing can be gained by doing nothing, which is what we have been doing for the last decade."

Note: Red China has done plenty during the past decade. Fought and killed UN soldiers (mostly Americans) in Korea, raped Tibet (killing thousands), taken over part of India, infiltrated and subverted practically all of Southeast Asia, conducted a massive and illicit narcotics business throughout the world pouring millions of dollars worth of drugs into the US and other free-world countries, refused to recognize the International Red Cross, and constantly argued with Khrushchev in behalf of a tougher stand against the West.

Apparently, successfully preventing admission of the Red Regime to the UN for a decade is "doing nothing" in the Post's opinion.

Oct. 7, 1961 - Realism and Formosa

Criticises the speech of Foreign Minister Shen Chang-huan of Nationalist China in the UN in opposition to admission of the Red Chinese government. It defends those wanting admission of Red China as not wanting to "appease" the Communists. It goes on to say "It is true that the Chinese Reds often act like bullies, that their actions do not conform to the precepts of the UN Charter, that they remain branded as aggressors. But how does society deal with a bully? By ostracizing him and allowing him to grow stronger in isolation, or by making an effort to absorb him into the community, where he may be subject to some control?"

"Obviously the latter course is the better, although there is certainly no assurance it would work in the case of Red China. Nevertheless, the sensible and prudent policy would be to explore the possibilities and this is difficult while the Nationalist regime on Formosa, which holds one of the five permanent seats on the Security Council, is adamant against compromise."

Note: This editorial removes any doubt, if ever any existed, in the minds of frequent readers about the Post's approval of admission of Red China to the UN. The Post's comparison of the UN to "society" is a weak one. Russia, considered to be less militant than Red China, has exercised the veto 100 times in the UN. (She is a charter member and can veto her own ex-

pulsion) She has also failed to live up to her UN financial obligations, pleading inability to pay. (Russia spends about \$5,000,000,000 per year on propaganda)

A better analogy would be to compare the UN with a metropolitan police board and to compare Red China's admission to the UN to the inclusion of an Al Capone on the police board.

The Post's writers should know full well that if the United States turns its back, as others have done, on the principles upon which the UN was founded and starts to "explore the possibilities" of admitting an unqualified outlaw government such as that of the Red Chinese, that regime is practically assured of admission.

* * * * *

D. LAOS

Feb. 3, 1961 - The Cry of "Wolf" in Laos

This editorial begins as follows: "The official acknowledgment by the Laotian government that its appeal some time ago for help against invasion by Communist troops was false will tend to downgrade future Laotian reports of crisis."

Mar. 24, 1961 - The Laos Bequest

Describing the President's words on Laos the Post says "And so he uttered the clear firm warning that continuation of the Communist attacks will be met with the necessary response through SEATO and our own efforts." The editorial goes on to urge that we do not intervene militarily.

Mar. 28, 1961 - Decisiveness on Laos

This one praises President Kennedy's endorsement of a neutral status for Laos and avoidance of any hint of a "go it alone" military adventure in Laos. It also points out that stepped up Communist military activity may be to test competence and determination of the new administration. The Post says "If that is so, he has his answer. Western prestige is now unequivocally at stake in Laos."

Apr. 4, 1961 - Hope for Laos Peace

Advocates coalition government for Laos and says the risks that Communists may subvert and assimilate the government must be taken to keep US prestige intact without war.

May 9, 1961 - Our Role in Viet Nam

Praises President Kennedy's decision to avoid military assistance to Laos and urges the same attitude towards Viet Nam.

May 17, 1961 - Progress at Geneva

Criticizes the US position which had been to seat only the Royal government of Laos and points out that the Communist Pathet Lao group controls about two thirds of Laos, hence could mop up the remainder in short order.

Oct. 10, 1961 - Mild Optimism on Laos

Expresses optimism over the selection of neutralist Souvanna Phouma as premier of the Laotian government and says a neutral regime should be possible through the assignment of 16 cabinet posts. The Post doesn't make clear how this is possible since the Communist Pathet Lao forces, who kept fighting for 5 months after the ceasefire, control the majority of Laotian territory.

* * * * *

E. CUBA

Apr. 20, 1961 - The Notes on Cuba

Endorses President Kennedy's policy of non-intervention in Cuba.

Apr. 21, 1961 - Hard Lessons in Cuba

Gives reasons for failure of Cuban revolt against Castro, criticizes American participation, and urges non-intervention in the future.

Apr. 25, 1961 - Cuba and Formosa

Upon the failure of the Cuban invasion this editorial says the crisis may well give "a fresh understanding of a situation on the other side of the globe. That is the China problem." The editorial says "Americans are now alert to the danger of an armed Communist-oriented regime on an island 90 miles off our shores." It goes on to equate our relationship with Cuba with that of Red China and Formosa and says "But more Americans should now understand that Communist China cannot accept the the present status of Formosa any more than the United States could accept a Soviet base in Cuba."

Note: Aside from the usual pitch in favor of the Red Chinese government, this editorial is particularly interesting. It appears that this ^{Post} writer slipped up in acknowledging the

"danger of an armed Communist -oriented regime" in Cuba in his eagerness to give arguments in favor of the Reds with respect to Formosa. The Post has elsewhere insisted that Cuba is no threat to the US as they consistently argue against any positive action against Cuba.

Apr. 27, 1961 - Blinders for Blunders

Describes the Cuban crisis as a "proxy invasion" and says "A better informed public might have cautioned against a fillibustering expedition in Cuba."

Note: A better informed public would have known the truth about Fidel Castro's Communist affiliation long before he took over. The Post must share the blame, along with all the rest of the fuzzy thinking so-called "liberal" newspapers, for deceiving the American people into believing that Fidel was the saviour of Cuba.

Apr. 28, 1961 - The Methods of the Foe

Insists that America would be like its enemy if it intervened in Cuba and reverses its opinion (expressed in the April 25th editorial) as to the danger posed to the US by a Communist Cuba by saying "An island state of 6,500,000 people, which could be knocked out by American power in a few hours, cannot seriously be painted as a serious menace to the national security of 180,000,000 Americans."

Note: Compare again the quote in this editorial with the one on April 25th, just three days earlier.....

Apr. 25, 1961 - "Americans are now alert to the danger of an armed Communist-oriented regime on an island 90 miles off our shores."

Apr. 28, 1961 - "An island state of 6,500,000 people, which could be knocked out by American power in a few hours, cannot seriously be painted as a serious menace to the national security of 180,000,000 Americans."

EXPLANATION: On Apr. 25th arguments were being given in favor of Red China's position with respect to Formosa. On Apr. 28th arguments were being given against any US action against Fidel Castro.

QUESTION: What kind of mind can produce such a contradiction within a 3 day period.

AUTHOR'S ANSWER: Communist minds can!

INTEGRITY?

QUALITY?

AMERICANISM?

May 19, 1961 - Labels for Cuba

Disagrees with resolution passed by the House (401 to 2) calling for collective action by American states against a clear and present danger in Cuba. The editorial also points out that while some Latin nations are awakening to the threat of Communist subversion from Cuba, "they have been awake for many years to the threat of intervention by big powers." (Presumably they mean the USA.)

May 24, 1961 - Is Castro Thinking Twice

Endorses "tractor deal" and ridicules those who call it appeasement.

May 28, 1961 - Prestige and Tractors

Criticizes those in Congress who oppose the tractor deal and says "the critics ought to recognize that the prisoner exchange can strengthen our leadership in the New World."

Jul. 16, 1961 - Partners of Revolution

Emphasizes the need for the US to become a champion of social revolution throughout the world and says "Had the Kennedy policy been in force when Castro came to power in Cuba, it would have required our Government to make a much more serious effort than it did to cooperate with Castro, even when he was expropriating American property. Are we up to this sort of thing?"

Note: Does the Post really think assistance from the US could have converted Castro from what he already was..... a Communist?

Sept. 22, 1961 - Church vs Castro

Describes Castro's deportation of 136 priests and accusation that they were plotting to overthrow his government with Washington's help. The editorial then devotes considerable space to recounting the struggle between church and state in Mexico eventually resulting in the Church being shorn of secular power. It then returns to Cuba and says Castro's "course allows little room even for potential rivals for public faith."

Note: Catholic readers will, no doubt, be delighted with the Post's implication that the trouble between Castro and the church is a natural struggle for secular power rather than brutal suppression of religion in the usual Communist pattern.

* * * * *

F. THE CONGO

Feb. 6, 1961 - Peace Plan for The Congo

Urges consideration of Adlai Stevenson's recommendations for a coalition government represented by all factions in the Congo, including the Communists.

Feb. 16, 1961 - Double Test in the Congo

Urges coalition government for the Congo.

Feb. 19, 1961 - The UN Itself

Urges UN should have more power to settle Congo dispute. States that UN is more important than NATO and says "successful solution of the Congo problem is more important than our friendship with Belgium."

Mar. 22, 1961 - The Tangled Congo

Endorses the idea of widening the Kasavubu-Ileo government to include Lumumba factions. In other words, suggests coalition government, including Communists.

Jun. 22, 1961 - Moderation in The Congo

Expresses optimism on cooperation of various Congolese leaders and labels Tshombe as a "pro-Belgium right-winger" and implies that Russians no longer back Gizenga by saying "just as Gizenga for a time was the favorite of the Russians."

Aug. 4, 1961 - New Hope in the Congo

Indicates that the Congo has a new Premier, Cyrille Adoula, and that he even has the support of "left-wing" Antoine Gizenga. It goes on to say that "No doubt Tshombe will have to yield to the reconstituted government."

Sept. 18, 1961 - UN Force in Katanga

Hopes for UN success in forcing Katanga to join with other provinces in forming a Congolese government. The editorial acknowledges the danger of the UN paving the way for a Communist regime in the Congo but says "for the moment, since the die has been cast, it must concentrate on the success of its military operation in Katanga."

Note: Even though the Post acknowledges the possibility of an error in judgement on the part of the UN it rules out the

possibility of recognizing the error and refraining from using force to bring Moise Tshombe into submission and coalition with other Congolese leaders, including Antoine Gizenga the Communist. Even Great Britain which normally takes a more conciliatory attitude towards Communism and Communists has subsequently voiced her disapproval of the UN action against Katanga.

* * * * *

G. MISCELLANEOUS

Jan. 23, 1961 - Of Liberty and Restraint

Hints at need to abolish House Committee on Un-American Activities and Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee.

Jan. 29, 1961 - Each Man's Duty

Criticizes film "Operation Abolition," compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. States that the film "inaccurately portrays a San Francisco student demonstration against the committee as engineered by Communists." Describes the film as having been aptly called "forgery by film."

Note: The Post's views are in direct disagreement with the report of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI. The report is published by the Government Printing Office.

Feb. 4, 1961 - For Daring and Dissent

Applauds President Kennedy's speech urging freedom of expression on the part of public servants in the employ of the Government. The following is an excerpt from President Kennedy's speech: "Let it be clear that this administration recognizes the value of daring and dissent - that we greet healthy controversy as the hallmark of healthy change."

Note: This speech and the editorial on it are rather amusing in light of the subsequent experience of military "public servants" who spoke out too firmly against Communism.

Mar. 2, 1961 - Mere Admonition

Complains about two 5 to 4 Supreme Court decisions in favor of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and indicates that the narrowness of the vote precludes a change in the court's attitude. At one point in the editorial it either deliberately or accidentally describes the committee as "the

Un-American Activities group."

Apr. 23, 1961 - Anti-Communism This Week

Indirectly ridicules Governor Dalton's proclamation declaring an anti-Communism week in Missouri. The week corresponded to the presence of Dr. Fred Schwarz and The Greater St. Louis School of Anti-Communism in St. Louis. The Post does not mention the school or its distinguished faculty but ridicules the idea of Anti-Communism, dragging in references to the Birch Society which has been a favorite target of the Post.

Note: Aside from clever indirect ridicule, to the best of the author's knowledge, The Post did not give any advance advertising or coverage of daily sessions of the school which was endorsed by leading businessmen and politicians. In fact, the Post waited until 2 days after Dr. Schwarz had completed the program then ran a front page article on him. The Globe, on the other hand, ran advance notices, gave daily coverage of the school's sessions, and serialized Dr. Schwarz book.

Why does the Post have such an automatic aversion to a dignified, educational, and highly successful program aimed at informing the American people about their major enemy, Communism? Dr. Schwarz has conducted successful anti-Communist seminars in other large cities all over the country. A recent one, presenting such speakers as Dr. Edward Teller, Ronald Reagan, and Herbert Philbrick, was televised over 33 TV stations by Richfield Oil Company in California. It reportedly outdrew other programs such as Wagon Train and The Untouchables.

Jun. 11, 1961 - To Stem the Erosion of Liberty

This a massive editorial attacking the one-week old decision of the Supreme Court against the Communist Party, requiring them to register with the Attorney General's Office. The editorial minimizes the threat of internal subversion and describes the Communist Party as weak and ineffectual.

Note: Any student of the Communist movement who has read only one book, J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit," knows that the strength of Communists can never be gauged by the number of party members. They have never had more than a small minority in any nation which they subverted and took over. A few men like Alger Hiss placed in the right places can do untold damage to a country.

Those who might tend to swallow the Post's view about Communist weaknesses might ponder the news item which appeared on the back pages of the Post. This news item, included on the next page, shows the extent to which Communists have affected American thinking when they can get such support for their efforts against the Supreme Courts decision.

U.S. REDS OPEN DRIVE AGAINST SUPREME COURT

The New York Herald Tribune-Post-Dispatch
Special Dispatch.

NEW YORK, Sept. 25—Communists from 19 states, in the largest open party gathering since the Rosenberg execution protests of almost 10 years ago, opened a new front yesterday in their fight on the Supreme Court.

The objective of the new front, the National Assembly for Democratic Rights, is to solicit the aid of non-Communists in a propaganda drive to force the Supreme Court to reverse its decisions of last June upholding the Smith and McCarran acts. The Supreme Court has agreed to a rehearing next month.

Benjamin A. Davis, national secretary of the party, told 500 Communists yesterday at a business session winding up a two-day meeting at the St. Nicholas Arena in New York that they must organize protest meetings across the country and mount a letter-writing campaign to newspaper editors and members of Congress to bring pressure on the court. A program of action called for a union of Communists with religious, political, educational and labor leaders.

1200 Delegates.

The Communist delegates — 1200 registered—were in a jovial, confident mood.

Their numbers and their appearance—gray-haired men and women, well-dressed and well-groomed for the most part—seemed to refute the opinion held in certain intellectual circles that anti-Communists are fighting a myth and that the Communist party in this country is dead.

Communist speakers glowed over the success of a rally attended by 3000 Saturday night. They had listened to the Rev. Dr. Harry F. Ward, professor emeritus at the Union Theological Seminary, pledge his support to the new front. Also speaking and pledging support were Clark Foreman, director of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee; Royal W. France, executive secretary of the National Lawyers Guild, and the Rev. Richard Murfod, of the Soviet-American Friendship Organization.

Program Approved.

The delegates yesterday approved a program of action for the new front organization, calling for "some 50 new committees in 50 new localities throughout the land to help achieve the purposes of this assembly."

The program called for "a mighty movement" to have President Kennedy "instruct his Attorney General to support the petition for a rehearing in the McCarran Internal Security Act case. Telegrams, letters and postcards from individuals to the President or to his Attorney General are important."

"Assemblies for democratic rights should be held on city, county or state scale to advance the purposes of this national assembly."

Furthermore, it said, "public meetings, rallies, radio and television programs, letters to editors, and press conferences can be organized by local committees" to push the propaganda drive.

NOTE: These 1200 Communists are, no doubt completely dedicated to an enemy-controlled party which is aimed at destruction of everything for which America stands, including religion. Dr. Ward, who pledged support for their drive against the Supreme Court was one of the founders of The National Council of Churches.

Jul. 3, 1961 - Sound and Fury

This editorial blasts conservatives and anti-Communists and accuses the right-wingers of being small business men who are using the cause of anti-Communism to promote their own conservative programs. It drags in the old scare words like Ku Kluxers and Fascists and, as always, makes no mention of the multitudes of American citizens who belong to respectable study groups and who are seriously concerned about the threat of Communist internal subversion.

Note: It is a continual source of puzzlement as to who respectable programs aimed merely at informing Americans about Communism are consistently equated to the American Nazi Party; The Ku Klux Klan, or Fascists by the Post. It is indeed strange when a newspaper which constantly espouses academic freedom and decries "guilt by association" blasts any group identified as "anti-Communist," which attempts to inform people about our major enemy. Surely, respectable organizations such as the Roman Catholic "Cardinal Mindzenty Foundation and the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade deserve better than this. On second thought the Post's attitude on this subject seems to the author to be consistent with policies on other issues.

Jul. 24, 1961 - The Military Mind

Praises Senator Fulbright's memo aimed at silencing military officers who attempt to indoctrinate their men with "extremist" anti-Communist views. It again points out that the danger of Communism is from without not from within.

Note: Here again, is complete disagreement with the views of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI. The Post's views completely ignore the avowed aims of Communists, testimony of ex-Communists, and statements of informed experts on the subject. Would the Post have its readers believe that J. Edgar Hoover, who has worked intimately in this field for over 40 years, does not know what he is talking about?

Aug. 1, 1961 - Moscow's Manifesto

Discusses the new draft program for the Communist Party. It further takes the view that Khrushchev really believes in "peaceful co-existence" and expresses the opinion that the main threat implied in the new manifesto is an economic one. Senator Fulbright and the State Department are also credited by the Post with holding to this view.

Aug. 13, 1961 - The Frustrating Years

This is another large catch-all type editorial which minimizes

the threat of internal Communist activity, ridicules conservatives, Birchers, and anti-Communists in general. It paradoxically says American influence in the UN will diminish and that simultaneously socialism will expand and neutralism will grow. In denying any threat from Communism at home, the editorial says "We can reject suspicion of conspiracies at home and concentrate on proper defense against the real threat abroad."

Aug. 16, 1961 - Smear Campaign on Fulbright

Charges Rep. Dale Alford with smearing Senator Fulbright as a Red when criticizing him for his memorandum concerning activities of military men. The editorial attempts to smear Rep. Alford by saying his attacks on Senator Fulbright were aimed at pleasing "the John Birch Society, essentially the support that Mr. Alford had in unseating Representative Brooks Hays."

Note: As a letter to the editor published on Aug. 25, 1961 points out, the Birch Society was founded on December 9, 1958 and Mr. Alford unseated Brooks Hays November 4, 1961. California Attorney General Mosk's so-called "report" to Governor Brown on the Birch Society also states that it was formed in December 1958. A Post Mirror of Public Opinion article, entitled "If It Walks Like a Duck," presenting excerpts of the California Attorney General's "opinion" will be discussed later.

Aug. 28, 1961 - Man on the Way Out

Speaks of Dag Hammarskjold's annual report and points out that he has only a year to serve. The editorial enumerates his views on the role of the UN and emphasizes the need to strengthen it. It points out that we have not always cooperated adequately saying "But let us not overlook our own failures to act in the spirit of the Charter." The editorial also warns against "dangerous nationalism."

Note: The editorial doesn't say what "our own failures to act in the spirit of the Charter" were. It is also interesting that the Post is eager for the US to act contrary to the spirit of the UN Charter when it urges membership for Red China in spite of that nation's failure to meet the requirements of Article IV of the Charter.

Sept. 10, 1961 - Incredibly Bad Judgement

Criticizes the TV production by Paar in Berlin and urges disciplinary action against Army officers involved. The editorial, as is now known, greatly exaggerated the numbers of personnel and vehicles involved by saying "but when the television performer turned up so did two colonels, one

one lieutenant colonel, a major, a captain, two lieutenants and about 50 enlisted men, along with seven jeeps, some armed." It goes on to castigate American officers, saying "What execrable judgement on the part of these officers, slavering, no doubt, to get their pictures on television!"

Note: While this editorial does much to disprove its claim to being a quality newspaper, the Post can be forgiven the inaccuracies in details. But, what must offend pro-Americans is the editorials description as "slavering" our officers who are under the Communists' guns in Berlin. It should be pointed out here that Herbert Philbrick, FBI counterspy for 9 years, has said that Communist and Pro-Communist writers constantly use the technique of ridiculing our armed forces, officers in particular, to destroy confidence in them.

Sept. 12, 1961 - After Paar

This editorial takes note of the fact that Ed Sullivan was heading for Berlin and again criticizes the Army, saying "But does this mean that the Army, having obligingly moved some extra troops up against the East Berlin border for Jack Paar, will in duty be bound to do the same for Ed Sullivan?"

Sept. 21, 1961 - The UN's Great Task

Expresses hope that the UN can remain as Dag Hammarskjold envisioned it. The editorial points out that the Communist bloc should have more representation in the top 15 posts of the Secretariat. America holds 3 of the top 15 jobs while Russia holds only 1.

Note: The editorial doesn't mention that Russia has 3 votes in the General Assembly (Russia, Bylorussia, and Ukania) with the addition of Outer Mongolia making it 4 votes while the US has only 1 vote. It likewise does not mention Russia's abuse of the veto power or failure to live up to its financial obligations to the UN while the US is providing a lions share of the money to support the organization.

Oct. 4, 1961 - Modifying the Troika

Urges consideration and discussion by the UN of the latest proposal of Russia for a temporary Secretary General with 3 deputies, one Russian, one American, and one from an Asian or African country. It says Russia might be willing to accept the reality of the Hammarskjold concept under the appearance of the Troika, saying "If this is the objective, then the UN could well go ahead with a discussion that might lead to an acceptable modification of the latest plan."

Note: Two days later, Oct. 6, 1961, a front page article heading was "U.S. and Russia Agree on Thant as Successor to Hammarskjold." The body of the article included statements to the effect that the only disagreement was whether there should be 4 deputies or 5. The article was not an AP or UPI release but was written by Donald Grant, a Post-Dispatch staff correspondent.

Oct. 6, 1961 - The Soviet Backdown

This editorial goes to great lengths to picture Russian agreement on U. Thant as temporary Secretary General of the UN with 4 or 5 deputies appointed by him, as a great concession or "backdown" from their demands for a Troika arrangement. It uses this issue as proof that agreement with the Soviets does not necessarily mean a disadvantage to the West.

Note: The editorial does not point out that of his total UN votes cast U. Thant only voted with the US on several occasions while he supported the Russians frequently. He favors admission of Red China and one can but wonder what deputies he will appoint. Some backdown!

Oct. 8, 1961 - A Moderate Under Attack

Defends Senator J. W. Fulbright who is under attack for his attempts to muzzle the military men who were instructing their men in anti-Communist seminars, as well as participating in non-government sponsored meetings.

Oct. 11, 1961 - From Two Decisions

Points out that Edward Yellin who was denied a National Science Fellowship for having refused to answer questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities on First Amendment grounds in accordance with the US Supreme Court's ruling in 1957 in the Watkins case is placed in a predicament by being indicted a year after his testimony in 1958 after the 1959 ruling in the Barenblatt case, declaring the committee's authority unassailable. It goes on to state that the court should clarify its two decisions and says that "His (Yellin's) appeal raises grave questions about the Un-American Committee's precise authority and power of exposure."

Note: Those who admire journalistic quality cannot fail to notice the description of the duly constituted House Committee on Un-American Activities as "the Un-American Committee."

Oct. 13, 1961 - The President on Fanatics

Describes the President's speech at the University of North Carolina in which he indicated that Americans should be pre-

pared to live most of their lives in "uncertainty, challenge, and peril." The Post praises him for warning against dependence on illusory slogans as "Total victory." The editorial goes on to criticize Senator Goldwater and others on the "radical right" and accuses them of spouting patriotism while employing divisive tactics.

Note: The Post does not offer any constructive ideas as to any method of defeating the Communist Conspiracy which is completely dedicated to "total victory." The only suggestion the Post ever makes in the face of new Communist pressure is to compromise and give them something while insisting that this the only possible course.

Oct. 15, 1961 - Against Big Brother

Praises two Senators for blocking passage of a House-passed bill on Communist propaganda. The editorial criticizes Hubert Humphrey, usually a liberal favorite of the Post, for voting for the bill and describes Senators Mundt and Thurmond who also voted for the bill as "primitives." It goes to great lengths to picture this bill as an attempt by "Big Brother" government to destroy the freedom of Americans.

The bill merely provided for warning notices to be posted in Post Offices alerting patrons to Communist propaganda and individual alerts to individuals believed to be receiving large quantities of Communist propaganda. It also stipulated that if the alerted recipient did not wish to read the propaganda he could return it free to the Post Office. The editorial fairly drips sarcasm when it says. "Thus Big Brother would be strongly suggesting to the poor, defenseless American citizen that he ought not to read those nasty Communist words, but should Big Brother burn them up."

Note: The Post's concern for freedom on this issue and repeated use of the scare term "Big Brother" is laughable in view of its avid support for federal control of practically everything else, including education, electric power, medical care, farm production, labor-management relations, and prices. Apparently "Big Brother" should control everything except Communist activities. The Post is inconsistent on many things but its consistency on Communism should escape no-one who studies their policies closely.

* * * * *

APPENDIX II

MIRROR OF PUBLIC OPINION SELECTIONS

Jan. 17, 1961 - Soviet Science on Disarmament (Louis B. Sohn in The Nation)

Says the Russians sincerely want peace and believe it can only be achieved through total "general and complete" disarmament.

Jan. 23, 1961 - Latin America and Our Ideals (Thomas J. Watson Jr., President, IBM, to The Life Insurance Association of America)

Says economic conditions in Cuba caused Fidel's takeover.

Jan. 30, 1961 - The Curtain Falls (Editorial in the Washington Post)

Criticizes a Supreme Court decision in favor of film censorship.

Jan. 31, 1961 - The Advantages of Reversing Our China Policy (Stanley Spector in The Nation)

Urges a change in policy towards Red China, praises Communism in China, criticizes Chiang Kai-shek and suggests that Red China be admitted to the UN.

Note: Dr. Stanley Spector is a professor at Washington U.

Feb. 21, 1961 - Movie With a Message (Paul Jacobs in The Reporter)

Criticizes the film Operation Abolition and the House Committee on Un-American Activities and says no evidence has been offered to prove that the student riots against the Committee in San Francisco were under Communist control.

Note: J. Edgar Hoover provided such evidence in his report "Communist Target Youth" which is available from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

Mar. 6, 1961 - \$342,000 a Year Too Much (James Roosevelt in a statement to the House Administration Committee)

The speech criticizes the House Committee on Un-American Activities and urges curtailment of its funds.

Note: The House voted 412 to 6 to provide the requested funds. Based on a national budget of \$88,700,000,000, the funds for

the committee amounted to about .0004% of the total . How does this compare with a military budget of about \$50,000,000 000 representing 57% of the total?

Mar. 7, 1961 - Total Disarmament in Eight Years (Louis B. Sohn, Harvard Professor of Law in The Nation)

Urges that the US take the initiative in proposing a sweeping disarmament proposal.

Mar. 12, 1961 - New Style in Foreign Policy (Murray Marder in The Washington Post)

Praises Kennedy administration's more "flexible" foreign policy.

Apr. 9, 1961 - Why Not Sign a Loyalty Oath? (from a letter by Howard L. Parsons, Professor at Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.)

This article goes to great lengths to show that the request that a professor sign a loyalty oath to obtain a position at the University of Illinois is a great usurpation of academic freedom. He says such an oath is repressive in that it "proscribes membership in a particular party," that party, of course being the Communist Party, the subversive arm of a foreign enemy.

Apr. 20, 1961 - Cross-Fertilization on The Right (Ed Cray in Frontier Magazine)

Ridicules all anti-Communist groups in general including the John Birch Society and The Christian Anti-Communism Crusade and accuses some of getting rich through anti-Communist activities. The article even ridicules Dr. Fred Schwarz, Director of the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade.

Note: Life magazine's top Public Relations man, acting as a personal emissary from Henry Luce just recently made a public apology before millions of TV viewers in California for a smear article Life had run on Dr. Schwarz.

Apr. 28, 1961 - How to Fight Communism (Extracts from an editorial AMERICA).

Minimizes the threat of internal subversion in America and says major threat is the Red Army.

May 2, 1961 - Cuba and the West (An editorial in the Manchester Guardian, England.)

This editorial criticizes American handling of the Cuban

invasion and says that Cuba is no threat to American security. It goes on to say that Cuba is no more of a threat to us than Turkey is to Russia.

Note: The article fails to mention that Cuba is now part of the international Communist conspiracy to conquer the world and Turkey and the US have no such ideas of conquest.

May 4, 1961 - Does Latin America Want Liberty (an editorial in the Toronto Daily Star)

Criticizes America's treatment of Cuba in the past and explains why Fidelistas and Communists appeal to the Cubans and why Fidel has the support of the peasants and working class.

May 9, 1961 - Snooping Unlimited (From the Washington Post)

Criticizes the House Committee on Un-American Activities for seeking access to income tax returns in investigating Communist activities.

May 23, 1961 - Degrading Mindszenty (From America, National Jesuit Weekly)

Criticizes the anti-Communist groups including St. Louis Cardinal Mindszenty foundation, pointing out that it has no official standing in the Archdiocese of St. Louis. It says the foundation may have started out with the best of intentions but "it reckoned without the hordes of misguided fanatics and unbalanced zealots who need no encouragement to go out looking for Reds." It says if the group doesn't want to close up shop it should change its name because it is no honor to Cardinal Mindszenty for his name "to be associated with Catholic wreckers and rowdies who misrepresent the cause of human freedom for which he suffered."

Jun. 1, 1961 - British View of Cuban Fiasco (John Douglas Pringle, Deputy Editor in The Observer, London)

Criticizes Cuban "Fiasco" and explains that Britons don't understand why Americans are so opposed to Socialism and Communism.

Note: The reader will note the Post's selection of the title as "British View" implying, of course, that this is The British view, not just A British view.

Jun. 12, 1961 - Off Target (From Frontier Magazine)

Criticizes J. Edgar Hoover's report on the student riots in San Francisco against the House Committee on Un-American Activities calling it "a bogus report."

Jul. 3, 1961 - British View on Berlin (Editorial in the Manchester Guardian)

Urges that the West take the initiative on negotiations on Berlin, suggesting recognition of the Oder-Neisse frontier.

Note: Again "British View" is used, not One British view or A British view.

Jul. 9, 1961 - America: Choice Between Extremes (J. W. Fulbright in Senate Address.)

The Senator's words are unimportant.....just his usual supercilious sanctimony. The Post selected as sub-title the following: "U.S. Must Offer Middle Way Between Communism and Dying Old Order, Says Arkansas Senator."

Note: The proximity of this "middle way" to Socialism should concern all who cherish individual freedom. Many do not feel that there is anything wrong with the old order, namely constitutional government.

Jul. 28, 1961 - Legalism Not Enough on Berlin (An editorial in the Manchester Guardian)

Urges negotiation on Berlin and suggests a "package deal" involving "limited recognition" of East Germany in exchange for guaranteed freedom of access to Berlin for the West.

Aug. 17, 1961 - War, Peace and Berlin: I (Address by Fred Warner Neal, Prof. International Relations, Claremont College)

Says we are not being "pushed around" in Berlin and points out that our reason for being in West Berlin is no longer valid because reunification is not possible.

Aug. 18, 1961 - War, Peace and Berlin: II (Fred Warner Neal)

Urges that America should conduct policy in Germany with an eye to accomodation of Russians rather than pleasing West German leaders.

Aug. 20, 1961 - If It Walks Like a Duck (Excerpts from California Attorney General's Opinion on John Birch Society)

These excerpts which castigate the John Birch Society in the most sarcastic way constitute about one-fourth of the total "report" of Attorney General Stanley Mosk to Governor Brown.

The excerpts begin with "Dear Governor Brown: Pursuant to your request of recent date, I am reporting herewith on the

John Birch Society." Thus the Post distinctly gives the impression that the material presented represents an official report of Mr. Mosk as a function of his formal duties as Attorney General of California.

The full text of the Attorney General's comments include near the end the following comments which were not included in the excerpts printed by the Post:

"Having thus divested myself of some personal observations on the John Birch Society, I must hasten to add that they are just that ----- personal observations. As Attorney General, I am the chief law officer of the State. It might therefore be assumed by some that I am officially passing on the merits or demerits of the John Birch Society, that I am permitting or proscribing the propagation of their dogma or that I am "investigating" them to determine whether they should be silenced or put in jail. Such an assumption betokens an unfamiliarity with the United States Constitution."

"As Attorney General, I have no greater right, but no less a right to an expression of my personal opinion than any other Californian. This is the right of which I avail myself here. Accordingly, we have not conducted an investigation of the John Birch Society, nor do we intend to -- we are not "Birch Watchers." All of the material in this report has either been in the public press or was voluntarily submitted by interested citizens."

Note: Regardless of the readers opinion of the conduct of California's Attorney General in attempting to smear the John Birch Society by invoking his dignity as a high state official and disseminating his "report" widely, it must escape no-one that the St. Louis Post Dispatch led, by judicious editing, its readers to believe the excerpts they printed were from an official report of the California official. This should be rather disconcerting to those who consistently defend the Post because of its "quality."

Aug. 27, 1961 - Bigoted, Benighted (From the Financial Post, Canadian National Weekly)

Criticizes Senator Thomas J. Dodd (Dem.-Conn.) and the Senate Internal Security Committee for attacking the Pugwash Conferences and their wealthy Canadian born sponsor, Cyrus Eaton. It describes Senator Dodd as a "witch hunting member" of the committee.

Note: The editorial first appeared in The Financial Post in June 1961. Both the Financial Post and the Post-Dispatch refused to print Senator Dodd's full reply. The Senator's full reply was

published by the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on its editorial page on Oct. 31, 1961.

Senator Dodd is a moderate to liberal Democrat who has an outstanding record as a foe of Communism and who played an important part in stopping the selling of precision ball bearing machines to Russia. Cyrus Eaton, on the other hand is an extremely wealthy businessman who has frequently made the news with his pro-Communist activities. The Pugwash conferences sponsored by him have been effectively used by Russian scientists as a propaganda forum. Mr. Eaton's latest target is the FBI which Mr. Eaton describes in a letter on Chesapeake and Ohio Railway letterheads to the deans of many law schools as a "Gestapo". The letter was written on the strength of a news article in which the reporter said that the FBI was concerned about the possible admission of Red China to the UN and the number of Red Chinese who would then get jobs in the UN, possibly requiring more surveillance. Why is the Post, which normally emphasizes the "class struggle" and usually attacks big businessmen on most issues and generally favors liberal Democrat politicians, so eager to blast Senator Dodd and other detractors of Cyrus Eaton?

Sept. 1, 1961 - The Role of the Military (From an address by Senator J. W. Fulbright)

Presents excerpts of Senator Fulbright's speech criticizing military men for political activities. Senator Fulbright says his memorandum to the Secretary of Defense concerned the sponsorship by military personnel of public meetings primarily devoted to "highly controversial political issues." The "controversial" issues of which he spoke were anti-Communist issues and Mr. Fulbright nowhere in the portion of his speech included by the Post uses the words Communism or Communist.

Note: Since his insistence on restraint of military men on "controversial" issues, Senator Fulbright has raised some doubt about his much vaunted sagacity by publicly making in Europe compromising arguments favoring the Soviet position on Berlin while President Kennedy was asserting that we were going to stand firm in that arena. Senator Fulbright, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs must have given rise to serious doubts in the mind of Mr. Khrushchev as to our real position in Berlin and could very well cause him to make a misjudgement and plunge the world into war by overextending himself. Readers will no doubt recall that they have read no criticism of Senator Fulbright by the Post which uses fear of war to justify its position on other issues.

Sept. 7, 1961 - Crabwise Toward Negotiations (An editorial in The Economist)

Says that "French Reluctance and American Rigidity Hamper Talks on Berlin."

Sept. 29, 1961 - British View of the Kennedy Speech (From The Times, London)

Urges support of the UN and points out that the US "sometimes shows signs of a latent suspicion of the organization."

Note: Again its "British View" not A British view.

Oct. 13, 1961 - Witch Hunts Revived (Edward P. Morgan in ABC News Comentary)

Criticizes the anti-Communism wave throughout America and ridicules anti-Communist seminars for teaching that Communism's biggest threat to us is inside the country, not from abroad.

Note: Most informed students of the Communist conspiracy, including J. Edgar Hoover, lay great stress on the internal threat as well as the external threat.

Oct. 13, 1961 - Conservative Red Army (William R. Matthews in the Arizona Star, Tucson)

Points out that the Red Army is conservative and that its military leaders are not ardent Communists. It says "The Soviet Russian Red Army is not seeking new lands to conquer" and points out that since 1945 "the expansion of Communism has been made without moving a single Red Army unit."

Note: It is obvious that the article refutes the claim, often appearing in the Post, that the greater threat to America is from without, not from within. The astute reader will conclude that by selecting this article the Post was most interested in discrediting the word "conservative."

The editorial page of this date included not only this item and the one immediately preceding it, but also included the staff editorial described in Appendix I invoking the dignity of President Kennedy in castigating Senator Goldwater and other "fanatics."

* * * * *

APPENDIX III

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE

Sunday, March 5, 1931

Letters from the People

The Will to Disarm

May I commend you upon the very informative editorials that you have run on disarmament. I was glad to see you bring out the fact that the United States has been as much responsible since 1933 for road-blocking disarmament as the Russians have been earlier.

Would it be possible for you to give some editorial attention to the reason the United States has provided this obstacle to disarmament?

In the opinion of many, the cause has been the deep-seated conflict between a State Department that wanted the arms race ended but had not quite made up its mind how it should be done, and the Pentagon and the Atomic Energy Commission who firmly believed that national security depended upon arms.

The outcome of this unequal contest between a powerful sector of Government that knew precisely what it wanted and a weaker branch of Government that did not quite know what it wanted has been indecisiveness and confusion in United States disarmament policy.

The position of the Pentagon and the AEC is an understandable one on this. National arms have served national security in the past by preventing aggression and by defeating aggressors. The use of national arms has extended our territory.

But as Norman Cousins graphically points out in his new book, "In Place of Folly," we have now entered a new age in which the power of weapons has become so great that the very existence of national arms has become one of the major sources of national insecurity.

Thus common sense would seem to dictate vigorous leadership by our Government in developing a system of world disarmament under enforceable law as the best means for serving our national security.

Reuben Shaw
Cincinnati, Wyo.

Monday, March 27, 1931

Letters from the People

Communism's True Dupes

The most dangerous exponents of Communist methods, and in many ways the cleverest, are those who are parading as anti-Communists. They remind us of the warning attributed to Huey Long that if fascism comes to America it will come in the guise of Americanism. If Communism ever succeeds here, it may well wear the same guise.

The most offensive trick of the so-called anti-Communists, who toss random mud on their neighbors from behind the protection of the church or the flag, is the assumption of infallibility.

"If you eggheads criticize us," they say, "you are Communists or the dupes of Communists."

Logic is probably one of the studies these anti-intellectuals are afraid of. A freethinker taking logic learns that the assumption of infallibility is the device of poisoning the well. That is, if you disagree or criticize you are a Communist.

Has any spokesman for the Soviet Union ever thought of a more diabolical method for suppressing freedom of expression?

These anti-intellectuals are the true dupes of the Communists. Every demagogue and dictator, including Huey Long, Joseph McCarthy, Joseph Stalin, Adolph Hitler, Benito Mussolini and Francisco Franco, has been afraid of the universities—for these are the places where all ideas are examined, without fear, for their true values.

All of the mortals just named have tried to control the universities as soon as possible in their move to absolute power—several with terrifying success. Haven't our own so-called anti-Communists gone to the very heart of deception?

Can you think of anything more demagogic and less American than their position?

When will the eggheads stand up and fight the threat themselves with the eggheads, and stop this cowardly practice of ducking into the sanctuary of infallibility every time a blow is made?

Refined

Friday, April 14, 1931

Letters from the People

Togetherness

The Communist party line has become much more effective since it has gotten the right wingers in the United States as its dupes. Unbeknown to this patriotic group of flag wavers and jingoists is their participation in a plot to limit the freedoms of the American individual.

No more in this country may a man speak his piece and sit down unafraid of the consequences. Now he must answer to the state in the form of a congressional committee. He does not have the right to plead the Fifth Amendment which our founders felt was a necessary limit against statism because if he should exercise this privilege he is branded by the "right wing dupes" as a Communist. Why else would he hide behind the Fifth Amendment?

Oh, these "Americans" (as they choose to be called) are quick to find fault with others. The term "dupes" is not mine but theirs. The Communist party line had not been so effective in achieving its goals until they decided to fight for their individual rights in this free country. By so doing, they backed into a virtual gold mine. A gold mine for those that has such a rich vein in the "patriots" that all the party needs do is shake them up a little and they mine themselves. Hitler, too, got rid of the Communists in Germany. This was a good. It did not matter what means he used.

A demonstration by persons who wish to furnish persons and not part of the nation and what happens? The "Americans" are right there. "Right", "Red", "Communist", "Socialist", "Bolshevik", "Anarchist", "Dupes" in short "Investigate them!"; "Call on individuals!"; "Burn them!"; "Deport them!"; "Fry them!"; "Oh! Uncle Joe S. would be proud of them boys. I can hear him singing at his team now. 'You take the high (right) road and I'll take the low' oh! and . . ." and they'll both get there together.

Herbert D. Hinnegan

to author of
COLUMBIA, Mo.

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Letters from the People

The Greater Loss in Cuba

In addressing the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 27, President Kennedy said: "... If the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our own nation."

These words were generally interpreted to mean that, if other American republics did not join in a common effort to end Communism in Cuba, this nation would take things into its own hands and send United States forces into Cuba to do the job. "Should that time ever come," the President said, "we do not intend to be lectured on 'intervention' by those whose character was stamped for all time on the bloody streets of Budapest."

The President was right in speaking in the same breath of the putting down of the Hungarian revolt by Russia and the probability of an armed intervention in Cuba on the part of the United States.

If we were to intervene in Cuba with our own troops, we would do so in order to prevent the stabilization of a hostile government located in our proximity, which is much the same reason for which the Soviet Union intervened in Hungary. The trouble is that two wrongs don't make a right.

Only a clear and present threat to our military security could in the eyes of the world justify transgressing the U.N. Charter. Short of establishing bases for intermediate range rockets in Cuba (which, clearly, Russia would not need, since she has an adequate number of long-range rockets that could be launched from bases inside of her own territory), I fail to see what Russia could possibly do in Cuba that would threaten our security.

Are we, then, going to continue to help Cuban exiles to reach Cuba and set fire to department stores and other similar facilities? Are we going to continue to help Cuban exiles establish beachheads? And finally, if there is no popular uprising in Cuba, are we going to send American troops into Cuba to squish Castro?

If we are going to do all this, the United States will suffer an irretrievable loss because we would be guilty of an inexcusable violation of the United Nations Charter.

Cuban exiles could, of course, establish a beachhead and we could recognize them as the legal government in Cuba. We could then subsequently argue that we were rendering assistance to the rightful government of Cuba. It is conceivable that in this manner we might be able to feel some of our more glib friends. But would we be able to feel ourselves?

It is conceivable that by squashing Castro we would regain some of the prestige that we have lost, but by embarking on such a course of action we would lose far more in honor than we might gain in prestige.

I do not know whether we could squish Castro in this manner without getting into war with Russia. But I do know that if we should proceed in avoiding a war, we would live in constant danger of war. We should not be able to extricate ourselves from the current behavior of terror and we should be unable to make any progress towards disarmament through confidence and reduction. We would lose rather than gain in security.

Leo Szilard

University of Chicago

Sunday, April 23, 1931

Letters from the People.

Focus on a Heritage

Before this anti-Communism week is forgotten I wish to commend you for your sober editorial on a sane approach to this world-wide problem. A necessary discipline of our enduring democracy is to keep in focus our blessed American heritage of constitutional government based on our Bill of Rights.

In a week when so much has been let of focus I want to proclaim from the housetops that I believe in our churches and synagogues in their priests, pastors and rabbis. They are most loyal, trustworthy and prophetic defenders of our democracy.

History shows clearly that when the conflict becomes acute in a totalitarian society it is the free pulpit which alone can successfully stand up for human liberty and freedom and conscience. It should be remembered who defied Hitler. It was Minuth Molkie, Hans Gruber, Pastor Niemoller, Dietrich Bonhoeffer.

I want to be on record that I believe in the right of dissent, in a free press and in vigilant protection of civil liberties. I delight in the competition of the press to get behind the facades, the fronts, the false faces. I salute the civil libertarians as they defend to the death the right of man to free

I want to be on record that I believe in our educational system, in the free public schools, in the deal emphasis on the arts and sciences in higher education, and I have an abounding admiration for the great host of the teaching profession.

To focus on a "deviant" in any facet of our society—in church or classroom, in press or pulpit—and to hold up that "deviant" as the norm of our times is downright devilish—a distortion of historical fact that has damaging effects on our whole democracy, no matter under what pious or patriotic or propagandist crusade such attacks are made.

Finally, I believe in the common people of our country and the other countries of the world. They have an uncanny way of discerning the integrity of the true leaders—the Lincolns—and for distrusting the phonies—the Anna Burrs and the Birchen.

—O. Walter Wagner
Executive Director, Metropolitan Church Federation
of Greater St. Louis

Sunday, May 7, 1961

Letters from the People

What's in a Name?

People are so easily duped. If the words "American" or "Fight Communism" are put in front of the name of an organization that organization is taken for granted to be in American interest. But a name can be applied to anything. The question should be: Is the label justified? Often our greatest enemies are those who hide their true intentions behind the symbols or ideas we cherish.

Walking down Forsyth the other day, I passed a window that read: "Fight Communism." I entered and asked the man inside his purpose. First he told me that this was a non-profit organization sponsored by the American Legion. The purpose was, he said, to inform people what Communism was and what "Americanism" was. I asked, "What is Communism?" He told me that it was what the FBI and what the Communists themselves said it was.

Then I asked him what "Americanism" was. He told me that it was a way of life and then asked me if I knew of any greater country to live in. I told him that he still hadn't told me what "Americanism" was. He said that it meant freedom of speech, and a few other things I agreed on.

I then asked him if he thought that was like the one in his window— "Fight Communism"—encouraged intelligent thought or rather irrational fanaticism. At this point a second man stepped in from a back room. In the voice of one who is on the offensive he asked me if that isn't what I thought the Communists were doing: instilling irrational fanaticism. I said that I didn't think we should do what the Communists were doing.

He then asked me if I agreed with what the Un-American Activities Committee was doing. I said that there were some things they were doing that I didn't approve of. At this he informed me that I was wasting his time and he was sure that he was wasting mine. In the true democratic spirit—free speech and all that—he ushered me out.

If "Keep America Strong" means the denial of intelligent thought, of freedom of speech, freedom to criticize, freedom to see that our leaders are working in our interest, freedom to expose those men, especially in our government who have somehow crawled in and should not be there at all, then it does not mean the same America as established in the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence.

J. S.

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Letters from the People

Peace Corps for Cuba

The greatest danger confronting America is the double standard of morality.

In the Havana Pact signed by the United States and ratified by the Senate in 1933 we agreed "to use all appropriate means, to prevent any person, national or alien . . . from starting, promoting or supporting civil strife in another contracting state."

Yet for over a year we have been deliberately violating this. When Castro came to power, he even considered hiring Dean Acheson as his foreign policy adviser.

When the Soviet leader, Mikoyan, was in Cuba in February of 1959, he was bitterly criticized for the invasion of Hungary. But 82 percent of Cuba's exports consists of sugar, and when the United States cut off the purchase of sugar, it forced Castro into the Russian orbit!

The Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in California, has been so disillusioned by United States's actions that he declares, "We are guilty of every single thing that we profess to hate about the Communists." If one of our great religious leaders thinks this is true, what must the Cuban people think of us?

Is it not true that we should try mediation and conciliation with Cuba instead of military force? Would we not gain more by helping the Cuban people with economic aid and a Peace Corps than in any other way?

Jerome Davis

San Francisco, Calif.

Sunday, May 21, 1961

Letters from the People

Blind to CHANGE

Socrates defined his role as that of a **GADFLY ON THE** camp of government. His mission was to "bug" the government with his dissenting opinions. As we know Socrates wound up drinking a cup of hemlock, a drink which in many forms throughout the ages has been served to dissenters.

Today, the cup is brewed of opprobrium, mixed and served by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Everyone who dares to disagree is tarred with the same brush of "Communist, dog or fellow traveler."

No allowance is ever made for an honest disagreement based upon the real inner convictions of the individual. I say that there are thousands of individuals like myself in this country who are truly "independent thinkers." They belong to neither party.

I say that objective criticism from these people is needed desperately right now because our country is in dire peril not from Communism so much as from self-strangulation. The summit-wrecking U-2 fiasco of the Eisenhower Administration followed by the Kennedy Administration-backed Cuban invasion shows that we have nothing to hope for from either the Republicans or Democrats unless a basic change in the perspective of our policy makers is brought about.

The road we are on leads inevitably to the total destruction of hydrogen warfare.

Our leaders have lost "historical perspective." They are rigidly wedded to a capitalistic status-quo as though it was the granite block of eternity itself, when in fact, irreparable change is taking place.

The world struggle today is not between democracy and communism but between capitalism and socialism. We stand on the far right and cry, "We won't be safe until socialism is dead." We really say "communism" because this word has been made a fright to the public. Communist China (so we are told) stands on the far left, and cries, "We won't be safe till capitalism is dead."

In the middle stands Khrushchev preaching peaceful co-existence, a sermon we are determined not to hear because the core of our problem is the fact that the men who make our policy are afraid that capitalism cannot compete with socialism.

As long as we are afraid we will be a menace to world peace. We need as leaders men who believe in capitalism as strongly as Khrushchev believes in socialism. Only men who really believe in a product can sell it. Only by believing in it can we go on the offensive in the world, not with bombs which never win, but with ideas, which always win.

Gaddy

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Letters from the People

Alive and Let Live

The U.S. Administration has
been engaged for years in a
policy of "letting the people
live and let live" in Latin America.

It is a policy of indifference, this
policy of letting the people live and
let live, which has led to the
present situation.

It is a policy of indifference, this
policy of letting the people live and
let live, which has led to the
present situation.

It is a policy of indifference,

this policy of letting the people live and
let live, which has led to the
present situation.

It is a policy of indifference, this
policy of letting the people live and
let live, which has led to the
present situation.

It is a policy of indifference, this
policy of letting the people live and
let live, which has led to the
present situation.

It is a policy of indifference, this
policy of letting the people live and
let live, which has led to the
present situation.

It is a policy of indifference, this
policy of letting the people live and
let live, which has led to the
present situation.

It is a policy of indifference, this
policy of letting the people live and
let live, which has led to the
present situation.

It is a policy of indifference, this
policy of letting the people live and
let live, which has led to the
present situation.

Dupont

Monday, June 26, 1951

Letters from the People

Why Worry Over Berlin?

Why do we want to continue the stalemate in Berlin?

When negotiating the 1949 Berlin accords, a unified Germany, we continued to have the peace symbol on German nationalism, namely Berlin, the dominant position in world affairs.

What real profit, ideological or material, results to this country and our allies from the fantastic cost of maintaining this divided city?

In reality, is not our present position in Berlin indefensible, its security dependent on the whim of Russia and East Germany?

What possible advantage (against untold disadvantages) is there to us to permit Russia to force a showdown on the Berlin issue?

If the real importance of Western Germany to the Free World is its position as a buffer state, how is its position strengthened by our partial occupation of the city of Berlin? Would we not gain by the exchange of the western border area and population of East Germany for our mutual areas of Berlin?

True, the creation, agreement and execution of such a formula exchanging land and peoples would be neither simple nor quick, but it would be a positive action in the midst of inaction on our part and nightmare threats on the Communists and should be of ultimate advantage to all parties concerned.

Why not prepare and work for such a plan, instead of letting a supposedly "conquered" city prevent the possible (even if seemingly improbable) other agreements necessary to peaceful coexistence—where, after all, is the only alternative to war? Ray Jeno Bakos

Wednesday, July 12, 1964

Letters from the People

Let the U.N. Decide

Whether to resume nuclear weapons testing is a major question in Washington clamoring for an answer. Russia's loss of interest in the Geneva test ban talks, coupled with the suspension in some quarters that she is now testing, has increased the pressure for United States resumption of tests.

The Administration will do well to consider, then, not only the possible consequences of ending the moratorium on testing. World opinion figured largely in initiating the moratorium in October, 1959. If the United States now takes the lead in ending it, it will be bringing upon itself the condemnation of the world.

Again, if testing were resumed, it would be an invitation to all nations to seek membership in the "nuclear club." If this is done, the number of nuclear weapons would increase, and the dangers of fallout would be back with us.

Another result would be acceleration of the arms race. Russia has already warned that if we start testing she will. From the feverish competition that would ensue might come even more deadly weapons than the H-bomb.

A major casualty of test resumption would be the blow administered to the world's hopes for disarmament which have been manifestly due to the cessation of testing. The prospects of a world disarmed would be considerably dimmed.

President Kennedy has taken steps to have a panel of scientists study the problem, a part of which is to try to determine whether Russia is actually testing. This is good as far as it goes. However, test resumption is not an issue to be resolved by a panel of American scientists, nor yet by the "free nations" with which we are allied. It is a problem for the world community and should be presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

President Kennedy should be urged to take this important step, and suspend efforts at negotiation until then.

J. Stuart Innerst,

Director

Special Washington Program
Washington, D.C.

Monday, July 17, 1961

Letters from the People.

Two Questions

We read that the Berlin crisis could lead to nuclear war, so it seems worthwhile to examine this "crisis."

Russia proposes to recognize East Germany as a separate state and to withdraw her troops. In addition, Russia says that East Germany will grant to United States, Britain and France, the same right to enter Berlin as they now have—the only difficulty being that on entering the city papers will be stamped by East Germans instead of by Russians as is now being done.

Question 1. As the United States has recognized West Germany as a separate state, cannot Russia recognize East Germany as a separate state?

Question 2. If papers have to be stamped when entering Berlin, does it matter who stamps them?

If East Germany reneges in any way, we will always have the right and the privilege of going to war over the city of Hitler, Himmler and Eichmann.

Daniel Nugent
Santa Barbara, Calif.

Tuesday, July 18, 1961

Letters from the People

Speaking of Provocation

One of your reader wonders how Khrushchev could "be any more arrogant than he was to President Eisenhower when he refused to meet with him at the summit conference."

It is so easy for us in the Western world to categorically blame Mr. Khrushchev's behavior in Paris for the failure to attempt negotiations there, never for a moment do we acknowledge that the U-2 blunder and the way the United States handled it might have been a major reason for that behavior.

We should remember that the U-2 flight occurred while negotiations to stop atomic testing were under way as well as on the eve of the scheduled Paris meeting.

The U-2 flights were provocative, a clear violation of international law and they were acts of aggression. I wonder what kinds of "arrogant" behavior would be accused in American political leaders if a Soviet jet were shot down 1200 miles inside the sovereign territory of the U.S.A.

If this were not bad enough, to top it all off high officials of the United States lied and were frankly caught in their lies. Further, while negotiations at Geneva on atomic tests were going on, the United States announced the resumption of nuclear underground test explosions—unilaterally breaking the moratorium on such tests in effect since 1958.

A few days later the announcement was modified, but certainly enough steps had already been taken to threaten any hopes of settlement at Paris.

I do not feel that any observer of this volatile world situation is looking as closely or as honestly as he should if he can place all blame for any accident—such as the failure of the proposed Paris meeting—on the shoulders of one man.

Mrs. W. L. Vancey

Wednesday, July 10, 1961

Letters from the People

Fear the Red Danger

The real danger that underlies the present "Berlin crisis" is not so much the Soviet threat to sign the peace treaty with West Germany, as it is the possible extreme reactions from the West. The danger lies in our misperceptions and the fears which result therefrom.

We are inclined to think that if Khrushchev "carries out his threat" it will mean making a choice between "backing down" or war. This is a false judgment. The only "threat" which is immediately involved, if Khrushchev carries it out, is the possibility that the West may have to deal with, and therefore "recognize" the East German government.

Americans are inclined to feel that to "succumb to Moscow's demands" is to recognize the East German government, means abandoning the brave West Berliners, allowing them to be "swallowed up" by Communism.

But actually it is very doubtful that the East German government, which would no longer have the Red Army to back up its internal policies, could ever enforce its demands on West Berlin.

Thus, you and I can have to deal with, not perhaps even the nominal recognition of the East German state. But this would actually be more dangerous for the Communist government than it would for the people of West Berlin government.

Furthermore, it is more likely that with the Red Army pulled out East Germans would be even more apt to start their historic, economic and even political ties with other Germans, and gradually move out of the Soviet orbit.

In short, Communism is much more likely if Mr. K. "carries out his threat" than if the situation remains as is, and Russia, more than any one, fears a rearguarded American nationalism. That is why Mr. K. has not followed through on his previous threats, and that is why he has no intention of doing it now.

What he does intend to do, and what he is succeeding in doing, is to throw the West into confusion. By making us stand nervously for six months in fear of a possible military engagement he occupies our attention with a non-existent dilemma and thereby prevents us from taking the diplomatic initiative. We should follow Brandt's advice and "face the future related."

Columbia, Mo. Tom Fiddick

Sunday, Aug. 13, 1961

Letters from the People

Power Is Not Practical

The recent speech of President Kennedy has been favorably received by much of the press in this country and in Western Europe, as well as by many individuals of importance in public life. We as citizens and as scientists regret to state that we are not able to share this enthusiasm.

Although we might be misinterpreting the President's speech, we have the impression (and this seems to be shared by most people) that the United States is still largely following a policy based ultimately on military power.

We believe that difficult as it may be to change traditional thinking, it is absolutely urgent that this approach be abandoned and that we seek to establish a more practical basis for negotiation and action.

It must be recognized that the goal of preserving our intellectual and moral values and our legal and economic order cannot be achieved by nuclear war. We must put aside the advice of those who argue that such a war might leave us "victors" in some sense with perhaps "only" thirty to fifty million dead.

The point of view recently advocated strongly by some, that life can go on normally in all respects even after the loss of one hundred million lives around the world is contrary to all principles and feelings that distinguish the human being.

Now that we have the potential of destroying civilization, it is simply no longer practical to seek solutions to the world's problems based on military power. We suggest that the national interest would more truly be served by action in the following directions:

We must strive to perfect a strategy in our own country, and to offer the world a foreign policy which is consistent with our professed ideals. It is essential that we help to raise standards of living around the world. We must always be willing to negotiate our differences with others, clearly recognizing that workable settlements will contain some features unattractive to both parties.

In pursuing these aims we must support and improve that instrument which is the best hope of humanity in the present impasse, the United Nations.

Such a course, carried out intelligently and judiciously, cannot fail to secure friends for us, and more than that, maintain our moral and material leadership in the free world. The best hope of security lies in this direction.

K. Goldstein	C. Leowner
S. Korlin	G. Polya
J. Lamperti	G. Szego
Mathematics Department, Stanford University Stanford, Calif.	

Wednesday, Aug. 16, 1931

Letters from the People

Speaking of Sacrifices

President Kennedy uses cautious language when he prepares us for a coming war. Senator Goldwater does it bluntly, calling for "total victory." Many preachers we hear on the radio do it by telling us that we cannot have the Kingdom of God unless we fight Communists. All three kinds of these appeals call for great sacrifices on our part. I should like to outline some of these sacrifices:

If we go to war, no compromise can be considered too shameful to go into. We must continue to count Portugal's Salazar among our allies and so we cannot support such Christians as for instance the British Baptists in working to stop genocide in Angola, which these Baptists witnessed and recently reported, with horror, to the world. We must equally continue friendship with Franco of Spain, although his respect for religion other than his own is less than that shown in Moscow. So much for religion, preachers notwithstanding. Is that helping the Kingdom of God?

If we go to war, civil rights, freedom of the individual and allied blessings, must be kept in check, for no war is ever fought without that sacrifice. And the after-war period—if we live to see it—brings even greater contempt of freedom. Read some reports of conditions in South Korea.

Family? It is crumbling now, largely as the result of too many wars already gone through. Why exemplify of what is happening to families in China?

This list of sacrifices is much longer. The time to salvage the valuable parts of the American way of life is now, not after the bombs start flying.

Elcan Vornack
El Granada, Calif

Friday, Aug. 25, 1931

Letters from the People

A Liberal Rugged Individual

Opposition to the Peace Corps by a group of conservative students seeking to revamp the liberal National Students Association reveals again that this opposition is part of the conservative party line. It is difficult to understand why.

Admittedly, a superficial glance at the project reveals grave dangers; but these have been overcome by the directors without sacrificing the program.

Fears that the Corps would be considered merely a two-year fun-filled lark overcame have been dispelled by warnings of the rigors participants would face and by the tough training they are now undergoing. The possibility of corporamen insulting the native culture is being largely overcome by comprehensive, intensive study.

Further, corporamen have emphasized they do not expect to "save the world"; most express dislike of shallow "do-gooders." They do feel an obligation, however, to help those who had not the opportunity to be born in America—a wealthy America none of us young people are responsible for.

But the conservatives seem to prefer that all our young men stay in an over-glutted America hawking backyard barbecue cats which people must be cajoled into buying, instead of helping the hungry of the earth produce food.

Let us spread our blessings. At any rate, let the conservatives, who profess individualism, allow those who wish to help the hungry of the world to do so. Do these conservatives wish to have us all conform to the American success story?

Dorchester K. Hollings

Wednesday, Aug. 30, 1961

Letters from the People

Quadros's Broom

Janio Quadros, the popular President of Brazil and the Lincoln of Latin America, who used a broom as a symbol of his fight against corruption, has resigned. It was the extreme rightists, naively unaware of the forces that threaten to expunge democracy forever from Brazil if Quadros is not to succeed, who caused his resignation.

Quadros was implementing and leading that economic and social revolution which President Kennedy has said must come if democracy is to survive and flourish in Latin America, a revolt against social injustice, economic backwardness, graft and government inefficiency.

To execute this democratic revolution Quadros courted the Communists also, a distasteful yet necessary trick if the potent extreme left-trailers were to be dissuaded from violent revolution, and instead be encouraged to support the orthodox democratic reforms needed in inflation-ridden Brazil.

While Quadros ostentatiously opened trade negotiations with the Communistic bloc, though privately admitting little would come out of it, he cut the Communists at home off at the knees, raided their strongholds, and confiscated their inflammatory propaganda.

This is the man, Janio Quadros, who has been deposed, a man who not too many years ago, as mayor of the cosmic city of Sao Paulo and later as governor of its state, turned them into the most efficient, booming industrial centers in the world, a man who, less than seven months ago, was accorded by Brazilians the greatest plurality in the history of the country, yet today a man, abandoned by an affluent few.

The United States is not without influence in Brazil. We can let it be known that the mandate given Quadros must not go unheeded, for if Janio Quadros does not succeed, the affluent few will again rule the many, and the wails of the new-born will again grow louder, knowing that their chance of reaching the age of one will still be less than one out of two. *Shallotberry*

Sunday, Sept. 3, 1991

Letters from the People

The Russian Test

What Russia has done is inexcusable.

But let us remember that for months men highly regarded in public life have been urging that the United States do this same thing—and have been called patriots for doing so.

On the other hand those who have urged that the United States refrain from nuclear testing, on moral or public health grounds, have been called traitors, fellow-travelers and worse.

It is a poor kind of patriotism that would have the United States held in the contempt the people of all the world are expressing for Russia today.

What Berlin Means

I suppose no one in my country, or in yours, seriously believes that we mean to fight a war to prevent Russia and her allies from signing a peace treaty with Eastern Germany. But when Mr. K. announces that he will sign such a treaty before the end of the year, the headlines scream of a "threat to the vital interests of the West," the politicians shout about "meeting force with force" and the generals move up an extra division. Why?

In my view this rather hysterical reaction only serves to increase the danger of war, which is already so horribly real. When you get down to it, to affirm our readiness to fight and die for Berlin is just so much hot air, because if war does come then Berlin (like London, Washington and much else) will soon be little more than a heap of radioactive ashes.

What does a peace treaty with Eastern Germany mean for Russia and her neighbors? Or for us in the West? Can it do anything to end the present unstable, insecure situation in Germany, which is a continuous threat to peace?

First, it means accepting the existing eastern frontiers of Germany as permanent.

Second, it means accepting that there are two German states and that reunification can only come, if at all, through a long process of negotiation and, probably, the ending of the cold war.

Third, it means accepting Berlin, not as an occupied city shortly to be the capital of a united Germany, but as a divided city, stranded 160 miles inside Eastern Germany.

The first two points merely recognize facts as they have been for several years. Our German allies may not like it, but no one in Europe (or in America, I imagine) will lose any sleep because their demand to restore the frontiers of Hitler's Reich has come unmet.

But what of point three? Is this a threat to Berlin's freedom? Certainly it means some cutting down to size of the inflated phrases about "a bastion of the West" and "a beacon of liberty." Such talk overlooks the realities of the situation and does no service to the Berliners themselves. Their main concern, I feel sure, is to live their own lives in peace and security and there seems no reason why suitable arrangements, with east-west guarantees, should not be negotiated with Russia and East Germany.

Negotiations there must be; so why not now, before hysteria rises and the nuclear cannon on both sides are loaded, ready to go off at the drop of a hat? Mr. K. has made his suggestions and offered guarantees; if we don't think they're good enough then why, in Heaven's name, don't we put forward our own?

Christopher Meredith
Stanmore, Middlesex, England

Sunday, Sept. 10, 1931

Letters from the People

Away from the Brink

Russia, Britain and the United States stand ready under certain circumstances to use mass extermination to achieve their goals. Anyone who is not doing everything in his power to prevent these circumstances shows himself not only ready but willing. In a just universe a society which is ready and willing to use mass extermination will be exterminated.

The victims will not be "innocent" civilians. Nuclear war is not simply a catastrophe which we suffer. It is an unexampled tyranny which we perpetrate against our fellow men, a hideous obscenity against nature, a woeful blasphemy against God.

The guilt we all incurred by making and aiming these weapons could have been purged only by a humble and invincible effort to create the international climate and institutions which would have made their use impossible. Instead, we compounded our guilt by whoring up the arms race, or minimizing the evil, or busying ourselves with other things.

Both sides are trapped in the same sinking ship and in the same conduct which is sinking it.

Proclaiming that we will never surrender to each other, we have surrendered to the arms race instead.

We pretend to ourselves that our arms are defensive, theirs to terrorize and intimidate, but they are checked by the same fears, prejudices and hostilities that control us. And by the same good intentions: each side steps up the arms race in order to prevent war--by protecting its deterrent, or warning the other against recklessness, or demonstrating it will not back down.

And yet I believe that God would still pull us through, given the human instruments. Those who flee will help by witnessing to the degree of our peril. Those of us who stay to prevent--can we lock arms to brake the careening world?

We can try to help the neutrals persuade Messrs. Kennedy and Khrushchev to lock themselves and their assistants in private conference until they have agreed how to pull away from the brink.

We can urge the United States and the Soviet Union to negotiate immediately a cultural exchange involving at least 100,000 Russians and American students, teachers, engineers, artists, etc.

Mingling thus, we might recognize a little our common guilt, our common fate, even the good intentions we share. Understanding this, we could begin to forgive our enemies, and then God could begin to forgive us.

Curle Crowford
Annapolis, Md.

Sunday, Sept. 17, 1961

Letters from the People

Bargain to Be Made

There is still an honorable and constructive way to end the Berlin crisis.

The Soviet action of Aug. 13, in sealing off West Berlin from the East has created a wholly new situation. By closing the escape hatch Mr. Khrushchev has to a large extent removed "the bomb in his threat" without having to make any concessions to the West.

Beyond that, the Soviet action has taken out of Western hands the long-avoided decision whether to make one more attempt to reunify Germany at the price of its military neutralization or to accept the partition as permanent for the sake of keeping West Germany in NATO. The partition is now irreversible for the foreseeable future.

From the German point of view, Berlin can no longer stand as the symbol of eventual reunification and of a possible revision of the Oder-Neisse frontier. True, West Berlin still stands as a symbol of Western resistance to Soviet encroachment, but every thinking German in the East or West now knows that the dynamic significance of Berlin as the eventual capital of a reunited Germany has been destroyed.

What remains now of the Western negotiating position is to bargain recognition of the East German state and of its existing frontier with Poland in exchange for a new and, this time, unequivocal guarantee of Western access to West Berlin.

There is no doubt that this bargain can be made with the Soviets. The question is only whether the Bonn government can be induced to accept the deal.

But if Washington and London for once refuse to submit to a probable German veto, there is still one way in which acceptance of the inevitable might be turned into a constructive action.

The writer suggests that, at the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly, the United States and Great Britain move to admit to United Nations membership the severed parts of the three partitioned countries—Germany, Korea and Viet Nam.

This action would not prejudice the eventual reunification of these three countries, as witness the merger of Egypt and Syria into a single membership of the United Arab Republic.

But it would give the people of Germany, Korea and Viet Nam a voice in the United Nations; it would to some extent ease tensions by recognizing the status quo; it would give the United Nations a share of responsibility for preserving peace in these three critical areas; and, above all, it would constitute a major step toward making the United Nations a universal organization—which it must become if it is to make its full contribution toward the creation of a peaceful world.

James P. Warburg
Greenwich, Conn.

Thursday, Sept. 21, 1951

Letters from the People

'No' to Dr. Teller

I am appalled, disgusted and impatient with Dr. Edward Teller's most recent views as expressed via Alvin L. Blakeslee, A.P. science writer. For years, Dr. Teller has been whipping up a war hysteria and has been the foremost proponent of nuclear test resumption.

It is the Tellerites both in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. who actively have been promoting policies which may well doom mankind in the very near future. It is the rest of us who have acquiesced in these policies by not firmly demanding of leaders of both the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. that a peaceful solution of our differences be reached. In a very real sense, we are all therefore guilty of fostering the mania which has brought us to the threshold of a conflagration in which mankind and all forms of life face extinction.

I for one refuse to be seduced by Teller's diabolical incantations to promote acceptance of the idea that war can solve the world's ills, for this in essence is what is involved in his exhortations to arm, test and build the tanks, euphemistically labeled "blast" and "fallout shelters."

Will you be so seduced? If not, then you must use your most persuasive methods to convince our governmental leaders that an understanding must be reached with the Russians that will preclude war. The hour is past late.

Will humanity preserve peace — and compete on a non-military basis; or will we sink to the final abyss of extinction? Albert Levy
San Lorenzo, Calif

Sunday, Sept. 24, 1961

Letters from the People

Norman Thomas on Berlin

Gallup polls show a large majority of Americans ready to fight for Berlin. They don't show how many Americans know what they would be fighting about, or what it would cost. I have just heard that a high government official estimates that practically no one would be left alive east of Cleveland, O. Here are some facts:

As a result of Stalin's drive and very serious and unnecessary blunders by the Allies we are reduced to trying to save freedom for West Berliners in half a city stranded 110 miles inside Communist territory. Our Western rulers also talk rather hypocritically about wanting German reunification. It is a serious question whether De Gaulle or Adenauer really wants it at all and it is certain that neither the West nor the East wants it except as the reunified and rearmed nation might be in its camp.

As for West Berlin a distinguished member of its government has assured me that its citizens want security for their free city, assured access to the West, and the right to be an eleventh state in the West German union. Under these conditions he insists that West Berlin can carry on as a show place for democracy. To get that doesn't require a war which would destroy Berlin.

Khrushchev has already proposed that West Berlin be a free city but has offered none of the safeguards the situation requires. For that, he says, the West must ask an East Germany which he will formally recognize by treaty as he insists that we should. Such recognition, involving recognition of the Oder-Neisse boundary with Poland, would be simply a recognition of facts that have existed virtually since the Second World War, provided that with it went safeguards equivalent to those provided now by the physical presence of Western troops under the Freedom agreement.

Both Khrushchev and Kennedy proclaim, sincerely, that they do not want a war which would destroy most of us as well as the city for which it was fought. Khrushchev objects to the nuclear rearmament of Germany.

We ought to object to it about as much as the Russians, if history has taught us anything. The Germans who lived east of the Oder-Neisse line are now well settled in the West; fear of a rearmed Germany holds Poland emotionally with Russia in the Russian camp.

Why not, then, negotiate, as I am sure we could, for proper guarantees for West Berlin, even if it involves some sort of formal recognition of East Germany?

Why not go further and try for an extension of Austrian demilitarization to Central Europe as a natural beginning of general disarmament?

None of this will be got by exchange of threats or prolongation of the present horrible game of "chicken" as played crassly by Moscow and only a little less so by Washington.

Are two Americans ready to die by millions rather than admit that the question of some recognition of East Germany in the process of guaranteeing freedom for West Berlin is very definitely and honorably negotiable?

New York Norman Thomas

Thursday, Sept. 23, 1931

Letters from the People

Our Ex-Nazi Allies

As an American who has recently returned from a six-week stay in Berlin with considerable contact with the people of East Berlin, allow me to share with you my strongest single impression.

There is considerable economic dissatisfaction in East Germany, and a genuine desire for more personal freedoms; but the number one topic of conversation and complaint with the East German people is their fear of war and what they call West German militarism. This is as true of the unhappy 60 per cent who form the apathetic, apolitical opposition as of the 20 per cent who support Ulbricht.

War and West Germany are joined together in the minds of all East Germans. We in the West have confused our own views regarding the war menace of West Germany with the views of the East German people and government, and consequently have refused to credit the all pervading fear which does exist there.

Is there any basis for this fear? Despite the surrounding cloud of Communist propaganda, certain facts cannot be disputed. The West German army contains 60 ex-Nazi generals, and all of the 140 odd generals and admirals in the West German armed forces were high officers under Hitler.

Gen. Fretsch, the new command-in-chief of the West German armed forces, is a convicted war criminal; a Soviet court sentenced him in 1950 to 25 years in prison for a long list of crimes which have never been fully contacted.

The two former Nazi generals who have leading posts in NATO—Gen. Messinger, current chairman of the NATO Permanent Planning Commission, and Gen. Speidel, chief of NATO ground forces in Europe—are both liable to prosecution under Soviet law for war crimes committed during World War II on the eastern front.

The German army has a long history of interference in German politics, and the East Germans, through both experience and their education, know better than any other people what were the consequences. Familiar names in familiar places lead East Germans to the old conclusions.

The West German refusal to recognize East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia is seen as further evidence of aggressive intentions. In West Germany, irredentist organizations, with a combined membership of 2,000,000 and mass meetings of up to 300,000, demand back their old homes in land now belonging to East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union. Peace is demanded, but no one on either side of the Iron Curtain believes that any of these lands can be added to West Germany without a war.

Whatever interpretation we might give to these facts — and many others could be mentioned — we must try to understand the intense fear they instill, almost as a reflex reaction, in the hearts of people who have suffered in the past because of German militarism.

Bertall Olfman
St. Antony's College,
Oxford, England

Friday, Sept. 29, 1931

Letters from the People

What's Wrong With Science?

Tonight when I say my usual prayers I shall ask the Lord to spare at least two of your book-reviewers. My special plea will be for Professors Bushan and Levi of Washington University.

There was a time when the troubles of the world were ascribed to the machinations of the devil, to original sin, to the "fates." This is out of date. Today it is science and the scientists who brought us the mess we are in. If the "Humanists" do not put it as plainly as this, the implication of the views they express can hardly be doubted.

The title "Humanists" has been misappropriated. Humanity can only gain from knowledge—dependable, reliable, testable knowledge. This is precisely what science has given us, and this is precisely where non-scientific claims to knowledge, such as speculative philosophy, metaphysics and the like, have failed miserably. If the scientific enterprise is not a "human" one legitimately, then indeed the terms human, humanism and humanitarianism should be redefined.

But science is of the modern world, and the modern world is in deep trouble; ergo, the phoniest non sequitur of the age. The argument is so shallow that one would hardly be inclined to take it seriously were it not for the terrible urgency of the circumstances in which it is employed.

We may go the way of the dinosaur; and more to our shame, that our exit would be of our own doing. Should this come to pass it would represent a failure to apply the same objective, dispassionate, truth-seeking spirit to social and political problems that science has employed in other fields.

All that the "Humanists" seem to offer in our present dilemma, amounts to verbiage, and adds further to the great confusion inherited from ages of distorted notions. They pretend no special formula or wisdom to help us in our dangerous path. If our long history has not demonstrated that we cannot be safely guided by claims to "truth" and "wisdom" that are obtained by revelation, mystic contemplation, "deep insight," intuition, star gazing and the crystal ball—if so, then history would indeed be what Henry Ford Sr. said it was.

Finto

Sunday, Oct. 1, 1961

Letters from the People

We're One in Many

After listening to the President's address to the U.N., it occurred to me that we are too self-righteous and too intolerant toward the Communists.

After all, there are hundreds of alternative structures for satisfactory human existence. Ours is only one of them; the Soviet's another.

Since society is a function of human existence, it will probably always have both pleasant and unpleasant sides, and it is only natural that most individuals will not be as troubled by the unpleasantness in their own ways of life as by those in another culture. This does not mean other ways of life are really worse, and it certainly does not mean that other, different ways are wrong. I think we recognize this about everyone except the Communists.

Most Americans are strongly attached to the American way of life, usually described as "freedom," which seems to mean free enterprise, since few people take advantage of, or even see, the other freedoms available. I am very much with them in this respect, and I think our nation and our ideals are very much worth defending, but they would be destroyed by nuclear war.

It is an extreme, unrealistic and, at present, dangerous American nationalism which really alarms me. Must President Kennedy support this attitude? Is he really going to negotiate or merely demand and threaten? Is he really going to work for peace, considering the other side as well as our own, or is he going to insist on "caving in" and on defending America's past, whether right or wrong? Must we present our nation as a champion, even if we win nothing but destruction?

In short, couldn't we, as a nation, be more tolerant, more respectful, and more understanding towards our opponents? Actually we probably have a great deal in common with them and are exaggerating the differences that do exist.

To ask the U.S. to work for world peace is fine, but we can't shove our present responsibility off on them. The American people need to be taught to want peace and to work for it, to be less ambitious for its own ideology and to accept the fact that America is only one of many nations, and to see that if we don't arrange for peace, now, we shall face everything. **Deane Dwyer**
Washington

Tuesday, Oct. 3, 1931

Letters from the People

Free Speech in Webster

On Sept. 27 the Webster Jaycees sponsored and I attended a showing of the controversial film "Operation Abolition." I am deeply disturbed over the events which transpired at the completion of the film.

A member of the Jaycees introduced a member of the "Four Freedoms Study Group," who was to answer questions and discuss the nature of Communism in general. The first question asked of him was "Why was there so much fuss about this film?" His answer was that this House Un-American Activities Committee was just another committee of Congress, and had as much right to investigate Communism as the Kefauver Committee had to investigate the price of steel, and he implied that their methods were similar.

At this point I felt compelled to point out that the Kefauver Committee had never to my knowledge done any name-calling, never attempted to slander any individual either through guilt by association or through innuendoes.

The incredible reply which I received to my comment was a quotation from Dr. Schwartz, "If it walks like a duck, waddles like a duck, and likes to sit in the water, it must be a duck." When this emotional response had been completed a professor (I think from Washington University) arose to protest against what he called this unpurged guilt. Someone in the audience told him to shut up and sit down. Various other unpleasant remarks emanated from the floor.

Probably the most amazing of all events of the evening transpired when a red-faced gentleman rose, arms outstretched at his side, shaking all over with fists clenched, and challenged me and I suppose others of the so-called college crowd, to a fist fight.

If I had thought it would have done any good whatever, I would have stepped outside and taken up the challenge. But that would have only been an example of the very thing which I am writing against, that is, the emotional outbursts against Communism which suppress the right to speak, which use the very Communist tactics which they themselves are decrying: name-calling and hostility.

August C. Bolino

Associate Professor of Economics,
St. Louis University

Tuesday, Oct. 10, 1951

Letters from the People

Delusion of Righteousness

The American people are much indebted to Senator William Fulbright of Arkansas for his sanity and his courage in speaking the truth in these troubled times.

He will doubtless be attacked mercilessly for telling us that the policies of the United States bear a large burden of responsibility for the present trouble over Berlin. Yet many thoughtful people in this country agree with him.

I believe that hydrogen weapons are not our greatest danger. The really great danger here in the world today is the delusion of absolute righteousness—both here and in the Soviet Union. Only such an insane delusion would seem to justify the incineration of this planet in nuclear war.

We must all realize that our judgments are fallible. Therefore not one of them is worth the destruction of our planet. James Holland
Washington, D.C.

Sunday, Oct. 15, 1931

Letters from the People

How We Can Be Saved

The heat is on to build fall-out shelters. Perhaps some questions should be asked and some problems stated before people are panicked into a tizzy which may turn out to be futile.

We are told to build individual shelters. They will cost money. Not much, you say, when weighed in the scales with survival. But a lot for most of us. How many Indians or Mexicans or Nigerians have the money to build shelters? They are people, too. Shall we increase our foreign aid so that they can build shelters? Or are we only interested in saving our own skins — we and the Ku Kluxes, who have the bombs which can destroy these others as well as ourselves?

Individual shelters sound fine for individual families. But America is more than two-thirds urban. What about men in factories, families in huge housing developments, people in skyscrapers? Should we have huge communal shelters? If so, the government will have to build them. No one else could afford to do it. I have not heard of government plans to do so. This is a do-it-yourself project.

Suppose an obvious target like New York or Pittsburgh or Detroit is attacked. The attack would be on a saturation basis. Would the thousands and millions involved reach the shelters? How about the few outside who are left breathing? Can you imagine the mob scene, the outsiders storming the shelters of the insiders, hammering at the doors until the porch is breaking from doors being committed all to earth?

All the above presupposes that the shelter will really protect you. There is no such guarantee. I have talked with "experts" who say a shelter just might protect you somewhat from nuclear blast or fall-out; but it would be a death trap if biological, chemical or gaseous weapons were used. Other "experts" deny this. So let's all go into shelters to find out, once and for all, which set of "experts" is right. It would advance the cause of science for us guinea pigs to find out.

One last point. Has the ingenuity, the God-given inventiveness of man brought us to this that we accept the inevitability of living like sickly white vermin in holes in the ground? Shelters would be our final admission of futility, the mausoleum of our civilization.

The prevention of war will save us, and nothing else will. Peace is maintained by law—nothing else. Civilization will be protected by law. You and I will survive only if there is world law.

The heat is on for shelters. Let us turn it on for peace. Now, while we are still above ground.

George C. Holt

Woodstock, Conn.

Monday, Oct. 16, 1931

Letters from the People

A Gift from Government

In his September 1931 report to his constituents (No. 62, "Not Printed at Government Expense"), Congressman LeMay B. Curtis makes a statement the writer believes will astound many of your readers.

"Social security benefits are gratuities of the government—gifts, not something people paid for at all or are entitled to by right."

Lest I be accused of quoting out of context, it should be stated that Curtis was discussing a series of public hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee conducted July 24 to Aug. 4 on "the problems of health care for the aged" and that he explored what he termed the "truth" in the press, radio, television and the national magazines in re these hearings which he felt were outstandingly important and positive of "facts."

In a general discussion of what the social security system is, Cur-

The social security system is not insurance as we know it and as our courts of law interpret it. It has been called social insurance by some of the courts. It is this deceptive label which has led many sincere people to think of it as insurance of the kind we can buy in the market place.

Social insurance conveys no legal right to benefits. The tax payments are not basically related to the amount of benefits. There is no reserve fund sizable enough to insure the solvency of the fund. Its solvency depends upon tax increases in the future, expansion of the labor force, and continued prosperity and increasing standards of living.

The courts hold that social security benefits are not taxable income, as are private pension benefits. Hence, social security benefits are gratuities of the government—something people paid for but which is granted to by right."

Perplexed

APPENDIX IV

LETTER FROM J. EDGAR HOOVER TO
ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
March 1, 1960

Washington 25, D.C.

TO ALL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS:

It is an incontestable fact that our country, the symbol of the free world, is the ultimate, priceless goal of international Communism. The leaders of international Communism have vowed to achieve world domination. This cannot be until the Red flag is flown over the United States.

If, for a moment, the grandiose Red plan is scoffed at as being fantastic, consider that one-fourth of the land surface of the world and one-third of the peoples of the earth are now controlled by the world-wide Communist bloc.

Certainly, the Communist gains throughout the world are evidence enough that America, if it lowers its guard, may be someday an easy target for the Red threat. The Communist plan is to conquer the United States, if not today, then tomorrow; if not tomorrow, then the next day, next month, next year - there is no timetable, no "Five-Year Plan." This is evident in the machinations of the Communist Party, USA, as shown by the analysis of its 17th National Convention published in this Bulletin.

It is indeed appalling that some members of our society continue to deplore and criticize those who stress the Communist danger. What these misguided "authorities" fail to realize is that the Communist Party, USA, is an integral part of international Communism. As the world-wide menace becomes more powerful, the various Communist Parties assume a more dangerous and sinister role in the countries in which they are entrenched. Public indifference to this threat is tantamount to national suicide.

Lethargy leads only to disaster. The Communists have a savage plan of liquidation for a vanquished America. The blueprint can be found in the words of Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, who reportedly said that it was necessary to liquidate 800,000 "enemies" to solidify Communism in China. Another pattern is the plight of countless families in satellite countries who were torn apart and transported to the oblivion of Soviet labor camps.

Under Communist domination in America, the first campaign of liquid-

ation would engulf the lawyers, champions of due process of law; newspapermen, whose ageless fight for freedom of expression would have no place under totalitarianism; law enforcement officers, guardians of individual rights; governmental leaders, local, state and national; and everyone falling in the so-called "capitalist" category. Occupations and professions which the Communists term "useless and parasitic" would be abolished - clergymen, wholesalers, jobbers, real estate salesmen, stockbrokers, insurance men, advertising specialists, traveling salesmen - the list for purging is endless. No citizen would escape some form of suffering under a Communist regime. One need but to compare his own worth, his own ideals, his own religious beliefs with the atheistic doctrines of Communism to determine his priority on the list of liquidation.

The defense of the cherished freedoms secured and handed down to us by our forefathers is the responsibility of each American. Knowledge of the enemy, alertness to the danger, and everyday patriotism are the brick and mortar with which we can build an impregnable fortress against Communism. Only the intelligent efforts of all Americans can prevent the decay of public apathy from laying open our Nation to the Red menace.

Very truly yours,
John Edgar Hoover
Director

(Reprinted from the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, March, 1960.)

* * * * *